

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XII.—DECEMBER, 1879.

RELIGION IN HOLLAND.*

TO give a review and report on Dutch affairs in Switzerland, in a foreign language, within a very limited space of time, in a circle like this, may certainly be regarded as a very beautiful thing, but an easy task no one will consider it. Holland and Switzerland! What a diversity, but at the same time what a harmony is suggested by these two names! Here the land of Alps and glaciers; there the land of dikes and wind-mills. Here the splendid cradle of Father Rhine; there his extremely modest grave. Here, on the other hand, in the near vicinity, the last resting-place of the great Erasmus—with us, the city where he first saw the light of day. Erasmus! The name leads us back at once to the first half of the sixteenth century. Was it not the age of the Reformation, and was not the Dutch Reformed Church one of the earliest, most blessed daughters of the Swiss mother? But more: in both lands freedom of conscience has planted her banner, celebrated her triumphs, won her crown, thrown open her gates, as on hardly any other spot. The names of William Tell and William of Orange sound harmoniously together, and it is for the “children of the *refuge*” a question whether they have enjoyed the greater hospitality in Basle, or in some of the cities of our Holland.

I pass in silence, although not without difficulty, over many of your names, known and loved among us too—an Alexander Vinet, a Hagenbach, a Lobstein, without even speaking of those living. I pass in silence, too, over many other relations, theological, ecclesiastical, literary, and mercantile; and I can the more easily proceed from such passing allusions to the treatment of my present theme, because, with you especially, in the highest domain of all, the familiar “*tout comme chez nous*”—everything the same as with us—finds many an application.

* An Address by Professor J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., delivered at the Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Basle, 1st September, 1879. Translated for *The Catholic Presbyterian* by the Rev. M. J. Evans, Carnarvon.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

In many respects, my Swiss brethren and friends, we have the same conflict and the same cares ; but we stand also, thanks be to God, upon the same firm ground, and both have to speak of a hope which is never put to shame. Permit me, then, taking my position at that standpoint, to give you a brief account of THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN HOLLAND, and that in relation to the *Church*, the *School*, and the *Life*. I must not attempt to furnish precise details, often given before ; you will be content with a few *aperçus*, although sketched only in pencil. I wish, in giving these, to mention names as little as possible, and as much as possible to deal in facts.

Of the Church among us, just as among yourselves, one cannot possibly speak without the eye being instantly turned to the great opposing forces of Romanism and Protestantism. If three-fifths of the population still belong by baptism and profession to one or other of the Evangelical Protestant communions, the considerable Roman Catholic minority nevertheless press ceaselessly forward. "*Rome ne recule pas*"—Rome never retires ; the fair earlier days of comparative peace are over, and of the old watchword of the Ultramontanes on Dutch soil, "*Vindicamus hereditatem patrum nostrorum*"—we maintain the heritage of our fathers—no single syllable is forgotten. On the contrary, the hierarchical power, broken or outflanked in other lands of Europe, has found almost its Eldorado with us ; millions of gulden are annually expended upon the construction of sumptuous new churches, cloisters, and other institutions ; even the public architecture follows, as far as possible, the Romish ecclesiastical type, and no secret is made of the very sanguine hope that the days of self-disintegrating Protestantism are numbered, Ultramontanism already celebrating its triumph over its expiring foe. If, formerly, the greatest forces, both intellectual and financial, were in general found on the side of Protestantism, things have changed during the last few years ; and though our opponents have not to boast of any long list of proselytes to their Church, they can rejoice in the possession of not a few allies, direct or indirect. Impelled by necessity, they join hands for the moment in the domain of politics with the orthodox ; but already we have often been taught by experience how quickly this relation may be changed, and how easily superstition and unbelief may combine to combat the hated third party. No doubt, in some Roman Catholic circles of our land, a deeper disunion is at work, but the excellent organisation of their Church conceals from alien eyes not a little which elsewhere is only too quickly manifest ; and moreover, our venerable Old-Catholic (Jansenist) Church remains, even after the important events which have taken place within the last few years in its domain,—as opposed to the pretensions of Jesuitism—a protest, unquestionably interesting historically, and morally impressive, but, for the rest, of little avail.

But what were all this in comparison with the much greater conflict which now occupies minds and hearts ; and how entirely different would

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

our position be if we could only speak and boast, as opposed to the arrogance of Rome, of a vigorous, inwardly united and flourishing Evangelical Protestant Church in our midst! But we all know how far we are from this, and how much there is in the aspect of the outward Church that combines to draw from us the sorrowful plaint, "The crown is fallen from our head." In our land, too, everything has been dominated, so to speak, during the last twenty years, by the great conflict between Christian belief in Revelation and modern Naturalism. So great is the confusion that we are almost daily reminded of the old saying, "In those days there was no king in Israel, every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Nay, it seems very much a question whether the dubious honour of being farthest advanced upon the path of bold negation pertains to Holland or to Switzerland. In any case, we have but little cause for envying each other in this respect, and we have both much to amend. I know not, for instance, whether you have here carried matters so very far, that any preacher may, with perfect seriousness, claim a place within the Church for "the atheistic shade of religion and Christianity" without being called to account. This, however, I know only too well, that we are on the fair way towards raising such disorder to the rank of order in the Church. All that is possible is done to legitimise absolute freedom of teaching, which has been more and more tolerated and favoured, and seeks the removal even of the last restraining limits. The General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, constantly animated by the endeavour to retain together those belonging even to the most opposite schools (or "tendencies"), is at this moment reduced to an exceedingly perplexing and hardly tenable position. A decree of the highest Church Court, that no applicants for fellowship can be rejected on account of religious belief, however negative, provided only they declare themselves ready to profess the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, has called forth an unexampled reaction, in the first place on the part of the extreme left, for whom even this minimum of confession was still too much; yet more strongly and more universally on the part of the right, which cannot tolerate the eventual surrender of everything. They are the less disposed to such concession, because liberty is at the same time granted to raise freely other questions such as are framed in the spirit of Christianity and Reformation, and thus for resolving the Church, as a matter of fact, into a sort of miscellaneous Protestant Union. No wonder that, on the right and the left, a wish for peaceful separation is expressed, even on the part of those who do not regard as desirable the splitting up of the Church, on its parting asunder, into a number of little sects. Perhaps it is yet to be decided within this year, whether the present crisis is really leading to new combinations, or, on the contrary, is to end in a fatal consumption. In any case, things cannot possibly continue as they are.

If I am to lead you still deeper into the militant camp, it is evident that I must confine myself to matters that are general. Our "Moderns,"—

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

to speak of them first,—agree, as it seems to me, with their Swiss brethren on many points. In connection with the possession of no small scientific gifts, there are not wanting among them noble, strictly moral, deeply religious natures; the ground, however, of the Christian belief in Revelation is here not only deeply shaken but finally deserted; and a real dread of anything like positive dogmas may consequently be spoken of as the most characteristic feature. Their peculiar shades—we have intellectual, ethical, more or less Positivist “moderns”—cannot be further touched upon here, but at any rate we must carefully distinguish between a more moderate or conservative, and a more radical section. The former, greeted by their opponents as “the liberals of yesterday,” shrink more or less from the final consequences of their principles, and are content if they succeed in saving out of the threatened shipwreck the general foundations of religion,—namely, morality, and the belief in immortality. The others, however, to whom so many concessions have already been made *in* the Church, still go on making further demands, or, in part, they leave the Church; and this, either to seek communion in other ecclesiastical circles, or (as, *e.g.*, at Amsterdam), to combine into a so-called “Free Church,” in which, among other things, the question was raised at Advent season—“Jesus or Buddha,—which is the greater?” a question, as we should expect, by no means unanimously answered in favour of the former. As to such men of progress, it is certainly best to let them go their own way; with regard to the first-named, love can only hope that the word, “He that hath, to him shall be given,” may receive its fulfilment in many among them.

So long, however, as this does not take place, we must fight with spiritual weapons; and on the anti-modern side, too, this conflict knows no pause, although the combatants begin to grow a little faint and weary. Of this camp, also, with its diverse banners and colours, I would now take a moment’s survey. You will allow me, for the time, to comprehend, under one head, various ecclesiastical and theological tendencies, because it is impossible here sharply to distinguish them. You come first, then, after leaving the “modern” camp, upon a so-called *Middle Party*; with a not unimportant modification, the continuation of the old, well-known Groningen School, which, as a whole, has taken its position upon the ground of Christian supernaturalism, and in its teaching has frequently led to excellent results in the interpretation and maintenance of revelation. But, from the more positive side, this school is usually regarded with less friendly eye, because it decks itself with the name of *Evangelical* as a separate party-name, and when it comes to practical action, in spite of all its objections to Modernism, is generally found, hitherto at least, extending its hand to the “moderns” as opposed to the orthodox. It is true that this phenomenon, however much to be deplored, may at least in part originate where Biblical ecclesiastical orthodoxy, as but too often happens, degenerates into a narrow, lofty, unprogressive, or even retrogressive, orthodoxy.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Diametrically opposed to this centre you discover, on the extreme right, the *Churchly-Confessional* party, not to be confounded with the separate Christian Reformed Church, which, since 1834, has taken its own respectable place side by side with the great National Church, and in Kampen possesses its own independent and flourishing seminary. Without uniting with those who have come out, our strictly Confessional brethren have proposed to themselves the task of restoring the old Reformed Church upon the foundation of the Synod of Dort (1618-19), and at the same time have acquired considerable influence in the political domain. Here "*Calvinista mihi Nomen*"—Calvinist is my name—is the maxim; unconditional subscription to the ancient formulas is the *conditio sine quâ non* of all fellowship; the revival of earlier notions, conditions, and claims is the main thing; and while all newer ideas, even on the part of those otherwise looked upon as believing men, are regarded with great suspicion, the terms of the accredited Scholastic Theology of the seventeenth century are held in almost boundless honour and dignity.

With these Reformed Churchmen—as they prefer to call themselves, in distinction from the more Irenical orthodox—the preaching of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination is placed emphatically in the foreground; Christ is proclaimed, but only as having died for the elect; the verbal and mechanical inspiration of the whole Bible is, for the majority, an inexorable shibboleth; belief in an entirely faultless old translation of the Bible by no means a rarity—nay, they even entertain the thought of building up the Church of the future upon the firm foundation of a Reformed Vulgate. It is indeed no wonder if the great "Christian Orthodox party," of which we have now to speak in the last place, is a sharp thorn in the side of these High Churchmen, inasmuch as the theological conscience still forbids many an orthodox man to think of such an advance as this party has made.

The distinction between the "Reformed Confessionalists" and the "Christian Orthodox," both of whom are within the Reformed Church, cannot perhaps be better indicated than by saying that, with the former the Church and always the Church is the main thing; with the latter it is Christ and His Gospel. The watchword of the latter is, "Christian my name, Reformed my surname;" while the declaration is gladly added thereto, "*Neminem condemno, in quo aliquid Christi reperio*"—"I condemn no one in whom I discover something of Christ" (*Bucer*).^{*} The standpoint of the "Christian Orthodox" may probably be best compared to that of the "positive Union" in Germany; its spirit is that of a true Evangelical Alliance. The opponent whom this party attacks with all its might bears the name, not of Luther, or of Arminius, but of Antichristianus, with his legion of kindred spirits; and while the ecclesiastical question in itself is regarded as one of comparatively subordinate

^{*} [We rather think our friend Dr. Hoedemaker would not accept this sketch of his party as correct in all particulars. See his article in *Catholic Presbyterian* for April—"The Evangelical Outlook in Holland."—Ed. C. P.]

importance in the present day, the endeavour is made to accomplish its solution less by legal than by moral and therapeutic means. It is only what may be expected that, among the ecclesiastical and theological men of this tendency, too, much diversity prevails. With many, the authority of the Word of God and the historic character of the revelation of Salvation, stand decisively in the foreground, in relation both to Dogmatics and Apologetics; while others lay more special stress upon the ethical principle of the Christian faith. In one, the voice of criticism has the highest authority; in another the good found in different tendencies is employed, in a more eclectic manner, for the theological and doctrinal edification of the Church. Thoroughly-armed defenders of the good cause are found side by side with the more profoundly mystic spirits, who are heartily opposed to all party spirit, and who can bring themselves to tolerate the efforts of controversy from time to time only for conscience' sake. All, however, are heartily at one in this respect, that they bow to the authority of the rightly-interpreted and duly-maintained Word of God in Holy Scripture; they confess the true and eternal Godhead of their Lord and Saviour, and proclaim peace through the blood of the cross as the sinner's only consolation in life and death. While cherishing this higher unity, they can maintain sufficient calmness with regard to points of difference of greater or less importance in the ecclesiastical domain; they do not desire to restore at any price what is merely ancient, when it is untenable, but with God's help to prepare for the adoption of what they regard as the "better new;" and they labour on in silent hope, knowing that, as matters now stand, they are regarded by the one side as too charitable, and by the other as too narrow.

All that has hitherto been said has reference specially to the still existing, though deeply shaken, Dutch Reformed Church, but the same thing may in general be asserted with regard to the smaller ecclesiastical communities also. With the majority of our Lutherans and Mennonites, Modernism has the upper hand, although not without vigorous protest; there are Baptist congregations of which one can be a member, whether or not he regards baptism as desirable for himself and his children. The Remonstrants, with the entire abandonment of the old Arminian type of doctrine, have thrown their doors wide open to all who desire to nourish and cherish the religious life upon the foundation of the Gospel of Jesus. In striking contrast with such liberality is the exclusive spirit of the "Geuzenvolk" in the National Church, who, where they possess the right of election, usually appoint as preachers and elders those who raise highest the banner of orthodox formulas, nay, may sometimes be called in theory and practice "plus Calviniste que Calvin"—more Calvinistic than Calvin; and not a few display more concern about the *right* believing than about the right *believing* of the men of their choice. Under such circumstances, the spirit of true Christian devotion and forbearance can certainly celebrate no brilliant triumphs. We have in this respect, I fear, rather retrograded than advanced, and that which was

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

said twelve years ago can hardly be repeated now: "More than some years ago has the conviction become powerful and general among the orthodox, that not this or that doctrine, but the living, glorified Lord of the Church Himself must be the main substance of preaching and confession." * On the contrary, a *doctrinaire* intellectualism raises ever higher the wall of separation between brother and brother, and their representative men ridicule the endeavour of an Alliance like this as a sort of "Christian hotch-potch."

In connection with the melancholy splitting-up of our forces, the neglect of church attendance is, alas! on the increase in many places—although in this respect things are not so bad with us as elsewhere—and, on the other hand, the influence of the pulpit on public life has, on the whole, considerably decreased. Unbelief has slain its thousands, indifference its tens of thousands; and the growing lack of candidates, in consequence of which about a seventh part of the pastorates in our Church have, during a longer or shorter period, remained vacant, augments yet farther the number of sheep without a shepherd. Where should I find an end, if I would enumerate all the parasitic plants which spring up out of the humid soil, under the shadow of a tree once so vigorous, but now sickly and almost dying? All the movements and currents of the time, Plymouth Brethrenism, Irvingism, the Separatism of the Old World and the Revivalism of the New, find among us their adherents, guides, organs. The Church is more than ever assailed, the Christian community is shaken, divided, scattered, as perhaps never before; and far and near, under a thousand forms, the one question is again upon the lips, "Watchman, what of the night?" Verily, amidst so many clouds and storms, we may well feel, now and then, as the companions of Paul upon the Adriatic Sea, to whom "neither sun nor stars in many days appeared," and who longed so earnestly that at last,—at last it were day!

But is the day at length beginning to dawn in the province of the higher and lower *School*, which, after all, comes into such continual contact with the Church? You shall answer this question for yourselves, after I have told you something more, alike of our universities and of our public schools.

With regard to the University teaching, I need not repeat what has already more than once been communicated to the friends of the Alliance. The character of our three national universities, Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen—to which, in order that we may not have too little of a good thing, has now been added that of Amsterdam—is certainly not entirely unknown to you. He who mentions Leyden mentions the Zurich of Holland, and, in so doing, pronounces at the same time an encomium and a complaint, of which the significance can be the less doubtful after the unequivocal manner in which the spirit dominant in the theological domain was manifested on the occasion of the last centenary in 1875.

* Prof. Doedes. "Account of the Fifth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance" (1867), p. 33.

The preponderating Modern Critical element, there brilliantly represented, has been farther reinforced since the seminary of the Remonstrants has been removed thither from Amsterdam, whereby a considerable accession has been made to the study of the History of Religions [!]

In the Groningen faculty, Modern and Christian Orthodox men work together; the latter, partly in a more historico-critical spirit, partly in a more ethico-philosophic. In Utrecht, the banner of Christian Supernaturalism—not at all to be confounded with the antiquated *doctrinaire* Supernaturalism of last century—has long been gladly held up, though not without important diversity of sentiment; the truth and Divine character of the Christian revelation of salvation are maintained to the best of one's ability, but at the same time the inviolable unity of doctrine and life is placed emphatically in the foreground. While this university has for a number of years counted the greatest number of theological students, we are far from saying that all of them, without exception, follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. Rather we should say that, in this time of inner fermentation and discord, many a one seeks the welfare both of himself and his congregation in his own way—whether it is that of radical Modernism, or of lofty and strict Confessionalism. In Amsterdam, where, at the present time, things are in the process of formation, the majority of the Theological professors are of the Modern tendency; and what may be expected from a new Churchly Reformed College, which, it is probable, will be erected in that city, wherein the students will receive their training in the very pronounced Calvinistic spirit of the Synod of Dort, is a question to which only the future can furnish any definite answer.

We must, however, here speak in particular of a great change, whose influence upon Church and Theology can as yet be but approximately calculated. Since 1877, the bond which united the two has been, if not wholly severed, at least considerably relaxed, by a new law with regard to higher instruction. Until then, the theological faculties had, in accordance with ancient custom, the definite object of serving the Dutch Reformed Church. Now, however—I simply narrate without criticising—the independent existence of these faculties is, not indeed surrendered, but they exist as such only for the State; they are to serve only as entirely open training-places for the general science of religion, wherein the teaching is not necessarily confided to professors of the Reformed Church, or even to Protestants, or at least Christians, but *may* be entrusted to Israelites, or even to heathen hands. If the Church still desired to avail itself of the University teaching, the liberty was granted her, under favourable conditions, of choosing her own teachers for the specially ecclesiastical branches (Dogmatics, for instance, and Practical Theology), two at each University, to be nominated by the General Synod. This gift of the State, however, introduced still more disquiet and confusion, because the greater number of the new chairs were given to men who, however estimable as individuals, were yet far

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

from corresponding to the wishes or expectations most widely cherished by the Church. Four out of the six belonged to that Middle Party—odious to many—one to the Orthodox, one even to the Modern section. From this naturally arose fresh dissatisfactions, divisions, endeavours to obtain something better, the end of which cannot as yet be foreseen. On the whole, we shall certainly agree in thinking that such separation in principle between Church and Theology cannot bring much good or profit to either of the two interests, least of all to the first. What is to be expected, in the long run, of a theological science which tears itself from the living root of the Church, and can be represented by Spinozists or Buddhists, as seems good to the Modern State? No wonder that the desire for “free study”—*i.e.*, for an entire severance of the Church from University bonds—is heard in an ever wider circle. But no wonder, at the same time, if the Christian scientific life in the native land of Voetius and Grotius, of Vitrtinga and Witsius, is for the present labouring under the obstructive influence of such a chaotic condition. There is no want of life and movement, but often very great lack of the deeper spirit of life; and party feeling may sometimes make even very learned doctors exceedingly stupid.

As regards the so-called Middle and Lower Schools, here, too, the opposition between the spirit of the age and Christianity appears at almost every point. The State School is called neutral, but was certainly in reality never so little neutral as at present. According to the precept of the law, the youth must, it is true, be trained “in all social and *Christian* virtues,” but a so-called general Christianity, offensive to no one, will certainly not commend itself to most believing Christians, either for themselves or their children. It is more and more evident that, in many public schools, a real propaganda of shameless unbelief is being carried on; that the children, even at an early age, are taught to make a mockery of the Church, of prayer, and of the Bible. Happily, as opposed to this radical heathenism, the necessity for essentially Christian grammar-schools and infant-schools is more and more deeply felt, and is so far as possible met; although, in this domain more especially, the fatal influence of ecclesiastical disorganisation and party feeling often strengthens the opponents of the good cause, and renders its friends powerless. But, that it is still true among us that “unity is strength” was shown in a surprising manner during the past year, when a petition to the king, based on the maxim “a school with the Bible,” received, in a short time, more than 300,000 signatures, and was regarded as highly significant, even by those who, for important reasons, could not personally unite in this line of action. As was foreseen, the king could not, under the advice of his existing ministry, give effect to this urgent supplication; but the Christian conscience of the nation has nevertheless been powerfully awakened by this manifestation, and the moral influence of the advocates of the Christian principle in the school has been not a little augmented in consequence. No small sacrifices have been made, and are still

made, on behalf of the Christian school, on the part of its friends. Of the Church also we may expect, that, in proportion as its self-consciousness is awakened, it will be less disposed to suffer itself to be pushed aside from this province. A severe conflict is perhaps still to be looked for before Church, State, and School find themselves once more in a normal relation the one to the other. Already, however, we can gladly note the fact that the impulse of a desire to lead children to Christ is widely felt, that in various ways it is receiving fulfilment, and, especially in the widening domain of many a blessed Sunday school, is it crowned with a fair result. Christian Holland certainly neither can nor will surrender its children to the spirit which always denies. Rather will it hold with the poet, that "out of ruins blossoms the new life;" and of that new life you will, we hope, hear yet greater things at the next general conference of the Evangelical Alliance.

But what, finally, is the condition of the spiritual and Christian *Life* in Holland, which is to be fostered by the Church and school? I answer this last question by a reference to narrower and wider circles, but must confine myself, here also, to single traits.

That the great opposition between Christianity and atheism deeply and fatally operates upon our national life, as well as that of others, is self-evident. Party spirit, moreover, in political and ecclesiastical affairs, exerts a destructive effect upon all classes and conditions of society; for although the year 1879 had long been fixed for the celebration of the centenary of the glorious Utrecht Union of 1579, it is hastening to its close without any national celebration, owing to the lack of unity and enthusiasm. Surely it is high time for the Netherlands to put away the festive cup so often drained, that it may humble itself deep in the dust before the God of its fathers. It is not without great cause that our former name and reputation have declined in other lands; the multitude cries ever more loudly, like the Romans of old, for bread and games; and the emancipation of the flesh, both in the theoretical and the practical sense, numbers its apostles and prophets amongst us, no less than elsewhere. Manifestly, too, in the Christian community it is proving true that "because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold;" and where so much wind has long been sown, the harvest of the whirlwind threatens to begin. Notwithstanding all this, to the praise of the Lord alone be it thankfully said, He remains with us too "upon the field, with His Spirit and His gifts." In every kind of way, evangelistic work is carried on, one might almost say "in season and out of season." By a good number of decidedly Christian preachers, some of them men highly gifted, is the pure truth, according to God's Word, proclaimed with power and gladness, often to large multitudes. Church bonds are relaxed, but the Christian community, though perhaps sick, is certainly not dead, and he who joins in the celebration of our beautiful missionary-festivals, held in the open air every summer, and hears the songs of faith and hope arising from the mouths of so many

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

thousands, receives a deepened impression that our Lord and Saviour still has a great people in the little Netherlands. What percentage of the well-known "seven thousand" we count, I do not venture to determine; whether, at present, that number is increasing or decreasing, I wish to leave wholly undecided; but it cannot be denied that not seldom many a faithful heart feels deeply dejected under the pressing distress of the times. Yet while evil is so noisy, the good goes on its silent way, under the blessing of God, and labour for the kingdom of God ceases not to bear fruit. If, in the sphere of foreign missions, the forces are divided on account of difference in principle, here, too, the controversy has had the same result as in the days of Barnabas and Paul; the outward separation has led to the extension of the field of labour. The cause of home missions finds numerous labourers of higher and humbler degree, and it is refreshing to see how the advocates even of very divergent tendencies join hands in the Samaritan service of unselfish love, which, impelled by the spirit of Christ, makes it its great business to testify and to save. If, since the last meeting of the Alliance, we have lost some ever-to-be-remembered heralds of the truth and heroes of love, such as Groen van Prinsterer, Chantepie de la Saussaye, Heldring, Cohen Stuart—we see other men of youthful powers coming forward to occupy the vacant places, of whom the best is to be hoped, and to whose word and work the faithful Lord gives unequivocal testimony. He who travels down the Rhine, from this to Holland, and in Gelderland enters the Magdalene Institute, flourishing in renewed youth, with its vigorous sister branches, the Orphanage at Neerbosch, and other flourishing institutions, will be convinced that the God of August Hermann Francke lives still, and still does great wonders. Our young men and maidens form associations, to do whatever they can in order to overcome evil with good. The higher interests of the working classes and of servants, of soldiers and sailors, of prisoners and orphans, are cared for with Christian love by means of societies formed for the purpose; sobriety and purity, in opposition to the demon of drink and of profligacy, are enjoined by word and example; the disgraceful Sabbath desecration is opposed with decision, and in other ways that which is possible is attempted, in opposition to the threatened unchristianising and moral debasement of our nation, to heal the sick and strengthen the weak. If all this cannot be accomplished without great personal sacrifice, yet, thanks be to God, the spirit of willing self-denial is still not wanting in the case of numerous Christians in Holland; and of many a one it can be said, that he has shown himself willing, not only up to his power, but beyond his power. For an eleventh church in the capital, there was lately collected, within a short time, the needed sum of F.170,000 (upwards of £14,000); and when in the country there was a question of building a new training school for Christian teachers, a simple farmer gave for the first stone a sum of F.12,000 (£1000). Of such instances, I could mention more, showing that at least in our Judah there are

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

"yet good things" * present ; they lead us to hope for still better things ; and as yet I have been silent as to that which is best of all. There are not wanting, on the whole, those "quiet ones in the land," who, although they have not a single penny to offer, most devoutly support every form of labour for the kingdom of God by their faith and prayer, and, spite of all apostacy, so firmly and joyfully live and die in personal communion with the Saviour, that, like your dying Æcolampadius,† they can place the hand upon the heart, and say, amidst all the darkness, "There is light enough here."

"There is light enough here." Let this, beloved brethren, in a wider sense, be our last word with regard to Holland ; or, if you will have it in an apostolic phrase, let it be this, "Perplexed, but not in despair." In many respects the day is far spent, but we have the prophetic word, which is very sure : "The Lord cometh," and "It shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light." Oh pray, PRAY, PRAY, for Holland also, that old land of freedom, that it may become in every respect truly free, not from Christ, but through Him and in Him ! Let us close our ranks, true and firm, shoulder to shoulder, in the common battle,— "one as the sea, diverse as the waves,"—fighting like St. Martin, to whom this church edifice is dedicated, and whose image also adorns the spire of our lofty dome in Utrecht, as he indeed drew the sword, but in order to divide his parted cloak with his poor brother, in a spirit alike of faith and courage, and of love and humility. And let us rejoice in the hope that one day, in God's time, for Holland, for Switzerland, for the whole suffering and militant Church, the motto of the city of Calvin shall become the prediction of a fairer future—" *Post Tenebras Lux*,"—After Darkness, Light !

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE.

THE TRANSVAAL BOERS.

[WE now redeem our promise, made in our last number, to present our readers with some portions of the paper on the Transvaal Boers, written by the late Dr. Livingstone, but not published. The paper was written about the year 1852, after the attack of the Boers on Sechéle, the Bakwain chief whom Livingstone was the means of converting to Christianity, and who still survives and bears the character of a useful Christian chief. Dr. Livingstone's station at Kolobeng had been destroyed by the Boers, and two other missionaries expelled, as referred to in the article in our last number, "The Church of the Transvaal." Besides being too long for our space, the paper of Dr. Livingstone contains many local allusions that would not be readily

* 2 Chron. xii. 12, Dutch version, after the Hebrew (see English margin).

† Reformer of Basle, died 1531.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

understood at the present time. The object of the paper, stated generally, is to show that the principles which regulated the treatment of the natives by the Transvaal Boers, and to some extent by other colonists, were entirely wrong; that this treatment was unjust and cruel; that the Boers were not justified in taking possession of the native lands for the purposes to which they turned them; that the attack on Sechéle and the Bakwains was particularly unjustifiable, and that this kind of policy has been the source of all our difficulties with the natives. Dr. Livingstone was extremely severe on the Dutch Reformed Church at the Cape, for not remonstrating against the wrongs perpetrated on the natives, and for welcoming the perpetrators of them to the communion of the Church.—*Ed. C.P.*]

ORIGIN OF THE BOERS.

VERY conflicting have been the opinions expressed by different writers respecting the South African Boers. This fact, and a certain friendly feeling towards them, as the descendants of the wise and good, induced us to study their history and peculiarities with more than ordinary care. Their history is simply that of a company of Christian emigrants placed in contact with tribes of comparatively defenceless savages; and it contains the usual displays of bloodthirstiness, selfishness, and sensuality, which form prominent features in all histories. We have no wish to revive the memories of the past, or portray those scenes of violence and wrong in which, to our regret, our fellow-Christians have figured; our thoughts are concentrated more on the present and future than on the past; only, in passing along, we must refer to certain horrid scenes, as the exponents of those principles which have proved an incubus on South Africa.

We have been accustomed to believe that the possession of a pure faith was a guarantee for the progress of a nation in the arts and civilisation. But the Huguenots who went to Manhattan advance with gigantic strides, while those who went to the Cape remain much as they were, or retrograde. The American lays down hundreds of miles of railroads, and electric telegraphs, on which can be measured degrees of longitude; and, crossing the sea with his breadstuffs, candles, ploughs, and wheel-barrows, undersells his cousins-german in their own market in Cape Town. There are no roads in Cape Colony deserving the name, except those constructed by Mr. Montagu, an Englishman. There are no public monuments, there is no University; and it is to be feared that those who, by their uprightness, are best adapted for seats in Parliament, will decline the honour, because deficient in fluency in the English language. Let the young Africander ponder these things. Our sympathies are enlisted on the side of truth and justice. We are conscious of no mental bias, except in favour of fair play and human progress. We have proceeded on the evidence of the friends of the Boers. We have not even discarded that of the well-meaning ecclesi-

astics who have always written in the apologetic strain, and evidently believe that Christian parents must procreate orthodox offspring. Yet we are forced to the conclusion that the Church in Africa occupies a false position. She is indirectly the mainstay of freebooting and slavery, for the suppression of which England sacrifices annually £600,000 and many of her bravest sons. It is a misfortune that the abolition of slavery in the colony was not the act of the Afrianders themselves. The feeling that it was done in spite of them prevents them from appreciating the fact that the state of freedom is the best for both white and black. There are fewer thefts and petty crimes now. The broken glass on the tops of vineyard walls built during the times of slavery does not require to be renewed. Indeed, the morality of the whole population is improved.

In writing of the Boers, we wish it to be understood that we use the term in the same sense as they do themselves. "Boeren" means "farmers," and it is only when identified with our modern English word "boor" that it is used to indicate clownish stupidity or rudeness. The Dutch farmers or peasantry, then, who now pass by the name, are descendants of certain emigrants who, about two centuries ago, selected the Cape as their home. They expatriated themselves in order to enjoy the privilege of worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences. In this respect they bore a strong resemblance to the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. They were undoubtedly men of God. Many of them came from Holland, and these were joined by others, who fled from the Huguenot persecution in France. The Cape colonist may well be proud of such ancestry. Willing to lay down their lives for the true faith, they braved the dangers of the deep, and preferred the harassing cares of an unknown clime and savage neighbours to peace at home, when this could only be obtained by a conformity which they believed to be displeasing to God. Having done and suffered much for their religion, they naturally felt that, in comparison with the Hottentots, who know but little of the Great Spirit, they were the peculiar favourites of Heaven. Some appropriated to themselves, in a temporal sense, Divine promises only meant to be fulfilled to the Church or its Head in a spiritual sense. They concluded, for instance, that the heathens were given *to them* for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

Others, however, and, we hope, not a few, held more correct views, believing that they had been brought to Africa in order to enlighten its darkness. But the other sentiments are still held by some. In evidence of this, it may be mentioned that the bicentenary of the landing of Van Riebeck and his party was observed in April last, at the Cape, as commemorative of the introduction of Christianity into Africa. This observance evinced no small amount of moral courage, for we find, from the journal of this same Van Riebeck, that in his person there was associated in the introduction of Christianity a principle fraught with

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1870.]

lamentation, and mourning, and woe. We see the apostle of peace on earth and good-will to man, utterly unable to restrain his greedy soul, when viewing the herds of Hottentot cattle quietly feeding near the fort. He wonders at the mysterious dispensation of Providence by which such fine animals had been given to the heathen. These mysterious dispensations of Providence have been sad stumbling-blocks to many a chartist and socialist since the good Van Riebeck penned his journal. This ancient chartist coolly records his calculations as to how many of the Hottentot "cattle might be stolen with the loss of but a very few of his own party." This is the first enunciation of what we call the Van Riebeck principle, and this unfortunate obliviousness of the rights involved in *meum* and *tuum* has been a prominent feature in the history of the border Boers during the last 200 years. It is a cause of bitter sorrow that the abnegation of all honesty has, during the whole of that period, been associated with the profession of faith in Jesus, the Prince of Peace; and when we find that this moral monstrosity is endorsed by the Church, we stand mute with amazement. Let this, however, be clearly understood; we believe that the majority of those who celebrated Van Riebeck's landing, abhorred, as much as we ourselves do, the principle the operation of which forms such a prominent feature in African story; and they are no more to be blamed for the pious part they acted, than the body of the English people, when thankful that China is opened, to be taunted with the iniquities of the opium war. . . .

CHARACTER OF THE BOERS.

The colonial Boers of the higher ranks are fully entitled to the eulogies which have been awarded them. Those of the Cape district especially, and portions of other districts too, may truly be said to equal in manners, intelligence, and wealth, our English gentlemen-farmers. Though generally of Liberal opinions in politics, they are much attached to the Church of their forefathers. They are well affected towards the English Government, and prefer tutors who can teach the English language in the families. In this, as in many other respects, they are decidedly in advance of the clergy, who persist in holding services in Dutch, though the vernacular of the Cape is a jargon which no Hollander understands. Oxen alone appreciate its beauty.

The Boers of a lower grade, who live far from the centres of wealth and civilisation, whether of French, German, or Dutch extraction, when not soured by bad manners or the villainy of English adventurers, are a body of industrious, well-meaning, and most hospitable peasantry. They are always civil, and decidedly more gentlemanly in their deportment than the English of the same grade who have settled among them. The salubrity of the climate is seen in the very large physical development to which most of them attain, though but little attention is paid to sanitary conditions. The custom of soaking their systems in solutions of tea and coffee extensively prevails; and when to this we add the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

injurious custom of sleeping in their wearing apparel, living in houses without chimneys, and having a superabundance of fat in their cookery, it will be evident that their robust health is not owing to any precautions on their part. When seen bathing, they are observed to be a shade darker than Europeans; and 200 years of the South African climate has developed a tendency to the *steatopygia*, or natural bustle, which has attained such striking dimensions in the Hottentot and other races of Africa. They are very successful in what Sydney Smith called the "great Irish manufactory:" they begin early, and have children late. So prolific are they that we have never met with a Boer who could remember one in the circle of his acquaintance that was childless. Such a phenomenon seems as rare as an old maid is among Caffres and Bechuanas. Yet orphans are never uncared for. The Boers are peculiarly tender-hearted towards the fatherless. There are but few checks to early marriage, such as exist in other lands. The industry of the parents usually suffices to settle the children in life. Stock is contributed for the purpose by the parents of each of the young couple; and they, by following the frugal example of their elders, amass, in the course of a dozen years, enough to purchase and stock a farm. The wife contributes to this desirable issue as much by her soap-boiling, &c., as the husband by his flock, and has as authoritative a voice as the husband in the management and disposal of everything about the farm. Of late years, the increase of the population has made it more difficult to obtain farms. Those available for Boers require a fountain which is capable of being turned to purposes of irrigation; and a farm generally consists of a small cultivated patch in the centre of many square miles of jungle. This is used for pasturage alone. Without the fountain, the farm is entirely useless; and many emigrants from England have found, to their cost, that a thousand acres in Africa are not worth half-an-acre at home. Many Boers cross the boundary in search of fountains, and when they settle, are in a most defenceless state, being separated from each other by several miles of territory. . . .

WHAT CONSTITUTES A TITLE TO THE POSSESSION OF UNTILLED LAND.

The extreme dryness of the climate, in all the inland districts, renders cultivation of European grain impossible, except by means of irrigation. On this account, the Boers have become exactly like the blacks, more a pastoral than an agricultural race; and their encroachments differ essentially from the advance of civilised communities into the domains of savages elsewhere. We beg particular attention to this point; for, apart from the violence and wrong committed in obtaining possession of lands hitherto held by barbarous tribes, we view the encroachments, *per se*, as perfectly justifiable. The primitive charter contained the conditions that we should "subdue and replenish" the soil. The earth is the original inheritance of the entire species; for it is written, "The earth hath He given to the children of men." Such being the charter on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

which all primitive lands may be held, it seems plain that the man who subdues or cultivates a portion of the earth, has a better title to it than he who only hunts over it. He bestows his labour upon it, and that is his property. Viewed in the light of this Divine and primitive charter, the rights of a civilised community, willing to till the soil, are superior to those of savages who derive a precarious subsistence from roots and wild beasts; because the former are willing to enter into the Divine design to render the earth productive of the greatest amount of good to the greatest possible number, and no man has a right to perpetuate a wilderness, in any part of the world, if his brother-man needs it for subsistence.

The most humdrum predicant will admit our orthodoxy up to this point. But the doctrine has rather a wide application. It would strip Earl Grey of his broad acres around Alnwick Castle, as well as Sandillah of the gorges and blood-stained valleys of the Amatola. It would chase the Duke of Sutherland into the sea, as well as Moshesh to the top of his mountain. It would place in the very same category the English and Irish landlords who evict their tenantry in order to form deer-parks, and the bushmen who endeavour to perpetuate a wilderness with their poisoned arrows. But, if all these have certain ancestral rights by which they hold their lands untilled, while a starving community is both able and willing to 'subdue' them, surely the claims of our savage neighbours demand some consideration. Unless we consent to be downright chartists, we must admit that the claims of even savages must be held sacred. If we deprive them, without compensation, of any of the resources by which they subsist, we are guilty of robbery. The principle is admitted in all cases at home. If land is needed for the use of the community, whether for a canal, a public building, or a railway, compensation is granted to him who has hitherto held it, though it may never have been disturbed by the plough. And we believe there is no instance on record of any savage tribe presenting factious opposition equal to that which railway companies have experienced. They have never been unreasonable when fairly dealt with; and a very small recompense is sufficient, in their own estimation, to extinguish their claims to any land which has never been cultivated. The egregious folly of England, in spending upwards of two millions sterling in fighting for lands which could have been purchased for one ten-thousandth part of the money, must be obvious enough to all except herself. But, for what does she weary, and vex, and fret herself in South Africa? Is she goaded to freaks of madness by the figment of political economists, that population in her colony will soon outrun the means of subsistence, and that therefore she is called upon to make room for her children,—“to protect them,” as the saying goes? When she was protector of the Caffres, it cost her nothing; as protector of the colonists, there is no end to the expenditure and ignominy. The encroachments of the Boers differ essentially from those of the American and other civilised communities, inasmuch as they

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

cultivate less of the soil than do the aborigines whom they expel. Indeed, it is not land they seek to appropriate, so much as cattle and slaves.

When we reflect on the cultivation of the soil by Boers, as compared with that by the blacks, it seems plain that the latter have the best claim to the land. Let England look to this. She may hand over her dearly-bought conquests to the Boers, but will Caffreland, in their hands, support as many souls as it does now? No part of the colony is so densely populated with whites, as the country inhabited by the Caffre tribes is by blacks. The latter, at Natal, supply the markets with maize, pumpkins, &c., at prices with which no Boer can compete. And, beyond the colony, though the Transvaal Boers have held all the fountains in a splendid and fruitful country untaxed for years, they never raised corn sufficient for their own support.

The Boers conceive themselves to be vastly superior to the blacks. They were enemies, and many of the latter are vanquished and despoiled enemies. The dominant race always explains its ascendancy, and excuses its tyranny, by the same self-complacent inferences. The Irish were for five centuries esteemed an inferior race by the English conquerors; but they have since vindicated their character in every department, and more especially in war. The Caffres are doing the same now. Part of the Boerish hatred of missionaries arises from transferring their hatred of the blacks to their teachers; and a singular feature in their family worship is the exclusion of all their coloured domestics from the family altar. Religion, with many of them, is a traditional sentiment, a system of theology, or a class of emotions. The fact that admission into the Dutch Church is obtained by any one who can repeat the catechism in school-boy fashion has contributed largely to this unfortunate result. Hence, when they become connected with the Church, they do not feel that they ought to bear out, into actual life, the truths of Christianity in their regenerating power. The Church thus fails to become a consuming fire against lying, adultery, slavery, and murder.

The distinction between the colonial Boers of the present day, and those of former times, the fac-similes of whom are to be found across the border, is never to be forgotten. It is by remembering this distinction that we are able to reconcile the conflicting statements of different writers. The farmers in the colony, at a distance from the boundary line, deserve many of the eulogies which have been bestowed. These beyond the border, and not amenable to law, deserve all the infamy which has been heaped upon them. . . .

SETTLEMENT OF THE TRANSVAAL.

The disciples of the Van Riebeck school, to whom our attention is now turned, were originally a portion of the Cape colonists, who became dissatisfied with the English Government for liberating their slaves. Being but slightly conversant with mercantile transactions, they seem to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

have undervalued the treasury notes in which their share of the twenty millions compensation-money was paid. They became the easy dupes of unprincipled speculators, and many lost large sums by accepting goods in lieu of their claims at the speculators' own price. Abuse of the English Government, missionaries, and philanthropists, was usually mixed up with these transactions. Discontent was fanned into a flame; and when the notes were exhausted, the same speculators with joy saw hundreds of the best farms in the colony thrown at once into the market, their owners having determined to leave the English rule. These, too, were bought up at prices far below their value, and fortunes were realised on their subsequent sale.

The emigrants, it is worth remarking, made no attempts to settle in Caffreland. The Caffres had passed that stage in which, as Van Riebeck remarked, thousands of cattle might be taken with only a very small loss on the part of the Boers. The loss might be rather considerable. They went their way, therefore, to the Zulu country. Now, the Zulus are the same people, in every respect, as the Caffres, but they possessed neither firearms nor horses. And to approach an army of such requires, when well mounted, much less nerve than to draw near to a herd of buffaloes. . . .

THE BOERS AS WARRIORS.

The Zulus were commanded by a bloody tyrant named Dingaan, who treacherously murdered a large party of the Boers. To avenge this cold-blooded massacre, a fight ensued, in which from 3000 to 5000 of Dingaan's warriors were slain. We have only the Boerish version of this affair, yet it is sufficient for the purpose of comparison. They state their loss to have been *six*. The vast superiority which the possession of horses and guns imparts is thus sufficiently obvious. The mode of fighting is the following:—The Boers approach the Zulus to within 300 or 400 yards, then fire, and gallop off to a considerable distance, and then reload their guns. The Zulus pursuing have by this time come sufficiently near to receive another discharge from the Boers, who again retire as before. This process soon tires out the fleetest warriors, and, except through the accident of the stumbling of a horse, or its rider's drunkenness, no Boer ever stands a chance of falling into their hands. The Boers report of themselves that they behaved with great bravery on the occasion. The Zulu warriors advanced in close columns, and their enemies were thus enabled to kill more than one with a single bullet. Such being the case, the Zulus were advancing in the face of almost certain destruction, without the possibility of engaging any except the solitary six whom accident threw into their power, while the former, by their own accounts, were exhibiting the same sort of bravery which Jack Ketch exhibits, his face covered with a piece of crape, albeit in performing the last offices of the law. In both cases the victims are securely pinioned; they can do no harm. . . .

The religious element, as might be expected from those who are traditionally Christian, enters largely into their vagaries. Many of the Potgeiter party believe that they, as the chosen people of God, are travelling to the land of Canaan. They were a few years ago by no means backward in stating their belief, that Potgeiter was a second Moses. The only maps in their possession were those in the large Dutch Bibles, bequeathed them by their pious ancestors. As these contain many interesting geographical facts, such as the latitude and longitude of the garden of Eden, with its four rivers, the pillars of Hercules, and bedstead of Og, King of Bashan, and, moreover, *in the Bible*, they never doubt but that Palestine is near enough for them to reach it in their ox waggons. These fantasies are not merely lodged in the imagination; they have a decided influence on their conduct.

When proceeding with their entire force (600 men) in September, 1852, to the town of Sechéle, in order to perpetrate a bloody slave-hunt, they requested a missionary to hold Divine service, and 'pray that they might be prevented from shedding innocent blood;' and on their return from killing upwards of 100 adults, and while actually driving more than 200 children to and from the waters along their route, as a flock of goats, they quoted Deut. xx. 10-14 as containing a full justification of all they had done—"When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: And when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the Lord thy God hath given thee."

Many believe that the blacks have no souls; and in this their faith and practice correspond. We have been told that the missionaries might as well attempt to convert the baboons on the rocks as the Bechuanas; but the declaration has always speedily been withdrawn when an offer was made of an instant examination as to whether the spokesman or the Bechuana could read best. The belief or the impression here referred to, must be the cause of their shedding human blood so often, without that remorse which, we have been accustomed to believe, cleaves to the murderer wherever the Divine will is known. They seem to be the victims of a strange infatuation, for, in the engagement with Sechéle, as soon as a Boer was wounded he began to roar out his prayers terrifically loud. . . .

THE BOERS' ATTACK ON SECHÉLE.

Last Synod received the Transvaal Boers bodily into the bosom of the Church, and at the very time when the Synod, in the presence of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Lieutenant-Governor, was performing the act of reception, the Transvaal congregation was murdering the people of Sechéle, and reducing his children to slavery. We have it on the most unquestionable evidence, that the congregation which the Synod received into the Church resolved, as the first act of independent existence, that no more missionaries to the heathen should be tolerated, and they actually plundered the two mission stations, and expelled all the missionaries.

There was no local cause for their conduct other than the deliberate design to regain the slaves lost by the emancipation of the Hottentots, and secure for themselves the entire trade hitherto carried on by Englishmen. They frankly admit that they never had any cause of quarrel with Sechéle. And yet, their plans embraced a six months' campaign, the reduction of four tribes to slavery, and the capture and plundering of certain English travellers and traders. The altogether unexpected loss of thirty-five men put a stop to further prosecution of their designs. A list of children stolen from the Backwain tribe alone shows sixty-eight boys and fifty-six girls—124 in all. Many of these are well known as having attended the mission school, and all of them could be identified. One of the immediate consequences of this slave-hunt was the commencement of cattle lifting by another tribe called Barolongo. This, be it remarked, is the very first instance in which Bechuanas have been known to steal cattle from white men. We shall see whether the outrages committed by vagrant Boers will not stimulate them to learn the art of war.

Pretorius, the commandant of the Boers, being surprised by the unexpected complication of cattle stealing, immediately despatched two sub-commandants, Jan Viljoen and Peit Scheepers, to request peace from Sechéle. If we remember the exposed condition of their farms, we see the propriety of the step; but the effrontery contained in the proposal almost exceeds belief. Leaving out of view the outrages committed on the adjacent tribes,—the men and women of Sechéle's own tribe murdered; the cattle and sheep stolen; their clothing, and other property, and the provisions for a whole year, destroyed—leaving, we say, these out of view, we see the modest Boer, with 124 children in his possession, modestly suing for peace. One of Sechéle's own children being among the number, he replied, "Can we talk of peace so long as you retain my child?" Khari (the child's name) was immediately sought out, and his price refunded to his owner by Pretorius; and, among the tears and sobs of hundreds of mothers, whose own children or those of their relatives are still in slavery, Khari was restored to his parents. The missionary witnessed this affecting scene. The child, about three years of age, had been allowed by his tender-hearted master to roll into the fire, and there were three large ulcers still open on the neck and other parts of the body of the child. Sechéle had previously to this, and of his own accord, proceeded to the south, in order to implore the English to assist him to regain his children. To any one acquainted with the policy of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

the present Cape Government, no encouragement would be given to expect that Sechéle's high ideas of the benevolence of the English nation, which he had gathered from the conduct of the missionaries, would be confirmed by an expensive journey to the camp of the Governor. . . .

ENGLISH LOVE OF LIBERTY.

Whether it is the result of the liberal studies which have been pursued in her schools and universities for centuries, or of the efforts of the noble band of sincere adherents to Protestant Christianity who have always stood up for the good and true—who have always preferred truth to the fear and favour of either princes or people, or of both of these combined—England occupies the highest position among the nations; she is distinguished among them for sterling integrity, and her sons for love of liberty in union with law. No nation equals her for practical benevolence and love of fair play; and though unwittingly drawn into a position in South Africa by which her real character is obscured, we have still hopes for the future; and our most earnest wishes for Africanders, both black and white, are that they may resemble her children in virtue and honour.

DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

[The events in the Transvaal and the country of Sechéle to which Dr. Livingstone alludes took place years before any minister of religion was sent to labour in the Republic. It is very gratifying to learn, as our correspondent in our last number showed, that the state of things in the Transvaal is now so different. It is also very interesting to learn of cases in which, when there were no ministers, godly laymen became so useful in upholding the claims of God on the people. Dr. Livingstone freely admits the existence of genuine piety in not a few of the Transvaal settlers, and he admits that there were many excellent qualities even in the men who treated the natives so unjustly. But his great argument is that this treatment of the natives was in utter contradiction alike of the law and the Gospel, and was the source of all the troubles which England has experienced in South Africa. It rendered it necessary for the natives to acquire fire-arms, and learn to use them; and now our great difficulty is to prevent them from using these on the whites, as the whites at first used them against them. That a better feeling now prevails among the Boers toward missionaries is probably due, in a large measure, to the firm stand made by Livingstone on their behalf. Such a voice as his, sounding over the civilised world, could not be permanently disregarded; nor could the conscience of Christian men, in the Transvaal or anywhere else, fail to witness, when the appeal was made to them, that Christianity demanded a different treatment of the native races. But for the unfortunate Van Riebeck principle, the Church would have marked with her displeasure the unjust treatment of the natives. That treatment would have been succeeded by one of justice,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

benevolence, and conciliation. The natives would not have been driven into rebellion. And our troubles in South Africa,—Caffre wars, Zulu wars and all the rest of them—would not have taken place.—*Ed. C. P.*]

THE LEGITIMATE PROVINCE OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IF the Bible be, as all Christians believe, the inspired word of God, then no expenditure of labour, having for its object the determination of the sacred text, can be considered too great.

If the famous actor could say of the great dramatist, that he desired to lose no drop of that marvellous man, much more should every believer in Divine revelation desire to lose no drop of this river of water of life, the words of the Holy Ghost; nor can we discover any reason why we should not be equally anxious that every drop of impurity, which, from any source, may have entered it, should be removed; it can be of no advantage to any one to accept, as a word of God, that which is only a word of man.

To accomplish this result is the specific end of "Biblical Criticism," technically so-called; hence, to define it, is to indicate its proper limitations. The day has long since passed, as we believe, for fear or prejudice against this important branch of Biblical learning. The Church accepts, with devout thankfulness, the results of the Herculean labours of the great scholars who have sought to furnish us the complete and unadulterated Word of God. The comparatively recent death of Tischendorf, caused by a nervous disease, induced by the peculiar nature of the work of deciphering and collating manuscripts, deeply touched the hearts of Biblical scholars all over the world, and secured for him an honourable place among the martyrs of science. In the discovery and editing of the Sinaitic Manuscript, he has erected for himself a monument more enduring than brass.

In the long gallery of those who have deserved well of the Church, and conferred lasting benefits upon mankind, Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Wetstein, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and many others, scarcely less famous, must occupy no inconspicuous place.

It may be readily confessed that "Biblical Criticism" has sometimes overstepped its proper limits, that it has been rash where it should have been reverential, that it has forgotten the broad distinction between the inspired oracles and the productions of the mere human intellect, that it has not been careful at all times to put its shoes from off its feet upon this holy ground; but, notwithstanding all necessary allowances for mistakes and errors, its results have been in the highest degree beneficial. It has provided for Exegesis firm ground on which to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

The religious element, as might be expected from those who are traditionally Christian, enters largely into their vagaries. Many of the Potgeiter party believe that they, as the chosen people of God, are travelling to the land of Canaan. They were a few years ago by no means backward in stating their belief, that Potgeiter was a second Moses. The only maps in their possession were those in the large Dutch Bibles, bequeathed them by their pious ancestors. As these contain many interesting geographical facts, such as the latitude and longitude of the garden of Eden, with its four rivers, the pillars of Hercules, and bedstead of Og, King of Bashan, and, moreover, *in the Bible*, they never doubt but that Palestine is near enough for them to reach it in their ox waggon. These fantasies are not merely lodged in the imagination; they have a decided influence on their conduct.

When proceeding with their entire force (600 men) in September, 1852, to the town of Sechéle, in order to perpetrate a bloody slave-hunt, they requested a missionary to hold Divine service, and 'pray that they might be prevented from shedding innocent blood;' and on their return from killing upwards of 100 adults, and while actually driving more than 200 children to and from the waters along their route, as a flock of goats, they quoted Deut. xx. 10-14 as containing a full justification of all they had done—"When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: And when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the Lord thy God hath given thee."

Many believe that the blacks have no souls; and in this their faith and practice correspond. We have been told that the missionaries might as well attempt to convert the baboons on the rocks as the Bechuana; but the declaration has always speedily been withdrawn when an offer was made of an instant examination as to whether the spokesman or the Bechuana could read best. The belief or the impression here referred to, must be the cause of their shedding human blood so often, without that remorse which, we have been accustomed to believe, cleaves to the murderer wherever the Divine will is known. They seem to be the victims of a strange infatuation, for, in the engagement with Sechéle, as soon as a Boer was wounded he began to roar out his prayers terrifically loud. . . .

THE BOERS' ATTACK ON SECHÉLE.

Last Synod received the Transvaal Boers bodily into the bosom of the Church, and at the very time when the Synod, in the presence of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Lieutenant-Governor, was performing the act of reception, the Transvaal congregation was murdering the people of Sechéle, and reducing his children to slavery. We have it on the most unquestionable evidence, that the congregation which the Synod received into the Church resolved, as the first act of independent existence, that no more missionaries to the heathen should be tolerated, and they actually plundered the two mission stations, and expelled all the missionaries.

There was no local cause for their conduct other than the deliberate design to regain the slaves lost by the emancipation of the Hottentots, and secure for themselves the entire trade hitherto carried on by Englishmen. They frankly admit that they never had any cause of quarrel with Sechéle. And yet, their plans embraced a six months' campaign, the reduction of four tribes to slavery, and the capture and plundering of certain English travellers and traders. The altogether unexpected loss of thirty-five men put a stop to further prosecution of their designs. A list of children stolen from the Backwain tribe alone shows sixty-eight boys and fifty-six girls—124 in all. Many of these are well known as having attended the mission school, and all of them could be identified. One of the immediate consequences of this slave-hunt was the commencement of cattle lifting by another tribe called Barolongo. This, be it remarked, is the very first instance in which Bechuanas have been known to steal cattle from white men. We shall see whether the outrages committed by vagrant Boers will not stimulate them to learn the art of war.

Pretorius, the commandant of the Boers, being surprised by the unexpected complication of cattle stealing, immediately despatched two sub-commandants, Jan Viljoen and Peit Scheepers, to request peace from Sechéle. If we remember the exposed condition of their farms, we see the propriety of the step; but the effrontery contained in the proposal almost exceeds belief. Leaving out of view the outrages committed on the adjacent tribes,—the men and women of Sechéle's own tribe murdered; the cattle and sheep stolen; their clothing, and other property, and the provisions for a whole year, destroyed—leaving, we say, these out of view, we see the modest Boer, with 124 children in his possession, modestly suing for peace. One of Sechéle's own children being among the number, he replied, "Can we talk of peace so long as you retain my child?" Khari (the child's name) was immediately sought out, and his price refunded to his owner by Pretorius; and, among the tears and sobs of hundreds of mothers, whose own children or those of their relatives are still in slavery, Khari was restored to his parents. The missionary witnessed this affecting scene. The child, about three years of age, had been allowed by his tender-hearted master to roll into the fire, and there were three large ulcers still open on the neck and other parts of the body of the child. Sechéle had previously to this, and of his own accord, proceeded to the south, in order to implore the English to assist him to regain his children. To any one acquainted with the policy of

the present Cape Government, no encouragement would be given to expect that Sechéle's high ideas of the benevolence of the English nation, which he had gathered from the conduct of the missionaries, would be confirmed by an expensive journey to the camp of the Governor. . . .

ENGLISH LOVE OF LIBERTY.

Whether it is the result of the liberal studies which have been pursued in her schools and universities for centuries, or of the efforts of the noble band of sincere adherents to Protestant Christianity who have always stood up for the good and true—who have always preferred truth to the fear and favour of either princes or people, or of both of these combined—England occupies the highest position among the nations; she is distinguished among them for sterling integrity, and her sons for love of liberty in union with law. No nation equals her for practical benevolence and love of fair play; and though unwittingly drawn into a position in South Africa by which her real character is obscured, we have still hopes for the future; and our most earnest wishes for Africanders, both black and white, are that they may resemble her children in virtue and honour.

DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

[The events in the Transvaal and the country of Sechéle to which Dr. Livingstone alludes took place years before any minister of religion was sent to labour in the Republic. It is very gratifying to learn, as our correspondent in our last number showed, that the state of things in the Transvaal is now so different. It is also very interesting to learn of cases in which, when there were no ministers, godly laymen became so useful in upholding the claims of God on the people. Dr. Livingstone freely admits the existence of genuine piety in not a few of the Transvaal settlers, and he admits that there were many excellent qualities even in the men who treated the natives so unjustly. But his great argument is that this treatment of the natives was in utter contradiction alike of the law and the Gospel, and was the source of all the troubles which England has experienced in South Africa. It rendered it necessary for the natives to acquire fire-arms, and learn to use them; and now our great difficulty is to prevent them from using these on the whites, as the whites at first used them against them. That a better feeling now prevails among the Boers toward missionaries is probably due, in a large measure, to the firm stand made by Livingstone on their behalf. Such a voice as his, sounding over the civilised world, could not be permanently disregarded; nor could the conscience of Christian men, in the Transvaal or anywhere else, fail to witness, when the appeal was made to them, that Christianity demanded a different treatment of the native races. But for the unfortunate Van Riebeck principle, the Church would have marked with her displeasure the unjust treatment of the natives. That treatment would have been succeeded by one of justice,

benevolence, and conciliation. The natives would not have been driven into rebellion. And our troubles in South Africa,—Caffre wars, Zulu wars and all the rest of them—would not have taken place.—ED. C. P.]

THE LEGITIMATE PROVINCE OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IF the Bible be, as all Christians believe, the inspired word of God, then no expenditure of labour, having for its object the determination of the sacred text, can be considered too great.

If the famous actor could say of the great dramatist, that he desired to lose no drop of that marvellous man, much more should every believer in Divine revelation desire to lose no drop of this river of water of life, the words of the Holy Ghost; nor can we discover any reason why we should not be equally anxious that every drop of impurity, which, from any source, may have entered it, should be removed; it can be of no advantage to any one to accept, as a word of God, that which is only a word of man.

To accomplish this result is the specific end of "Biblical Criticism," technically so-called; hence, to define it, is to indicate its proper limitations. The day has long since passed, as we believe, for fear or prejudice against this important branch of Biblical learning. The Church accepts, with devout thankfulness, the results of the Herculean labours of the great scholars who have sought to furnish us the complete and unadulterated Word of God. The comparatively recent death of Tischendorf, caused by a nervous disease, induced by the peculiar nature of the work of deciphering and collating manuscripts, deeply touched the hearts of Biblical scholars all over the world, and secured for him an honourable place among the martyrs of science. In the discovery and editing of the Sinaitic Manuscript, he has erected for himself a monument more enduring than brass.

In the long gallery of those who have deserved well of the Church, and conferred lasting benefits upon mankind, Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Wetstein, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and many others, scarcely less famous, must occupy no inconspicuous place.

It may be readily confessed that "Biblical Criticism" has sometimes overstepped its proper limits, that it has been rash where it should have been reverential, that it has forgotten the broad distinction between the inspired oracles and the productions of the mere human intellect, that it has not been careful at all times to put its shoes from off its feet upon this holy ground; but, notwithstanding all necessary allowances for mistakes and errors, its results have been in the highest degree beneficial. It has provided for Exegesis firm ground on which to

stand; the conscientious interpreter of the Scriptures has derived from this science a confidence which he could not otherwise have felt, and which enables him to speak as one having authority; he applies the measuring reed to the real temple of God, and not to some court of the Gentiles. It is impossible to overestimate the strength realised by the interpreter, when he feels his feet, Antæus-like, upon the real soil of inspired truth.

The labours of these great critical scholars have given an immense impulse to all branches of Biblical study, and have thereby conferred great and lasting benefits upon the cause of Christianity in general. Indeed, it is manifest that they have been providentially raised up and guided in order that the truths of Divine revelation might be more firmly based, and thereby prepared the better to meet that storm of unbelief which, even yet, continues to bear, with scarcely abated fury, upon the citadel of Divine truth.

The field of this science is, in one sense, wide, embracing almost the entire sphere of human learning. It would be difficult to say what realm of human investigation has been left unexplored, in the effort to determine the sacred text, or what branch of human knowledge has not been made tributary to its high purposes. In another sense, the field is limited; for, while the term Biblical Criticism is sometimes employed in a popular way, so as to embrace all Biblical learning, in its proper and restricted meaning, its sole function is, to determine the precise words employed by the men who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, to remove all stains, and brighten all obscure parts of this picture of silver, in which the golden apple of Divine truth is set.

It is well known that the original autographs have long since perished,—the oldest manuscripts of the Scripture-writers (we speak specially of the New Testament, those of the Old being still more recent) reaching back only to the close of the fourth century, and these but the copies of copies; and that, not only is there no “textus receptus,”—no manuscript that can claim the authority of a standard by which others might be tested,—but no class of manuscripts that can claim to be the lineal descendants of the originals, as against other families or groups. From a comparatively small number of “Uncials,”—some of them mere fragments, and all of them mutilated and more or less imperfect,—and a host of “cursives” of different classes and ages; from ancient translations which have come down to us more or less interpolated, from quotations in the “Fathers,” and from ancient liturgies and lectionaries, in which the reading is often doubtful, Biblical scholars have to furnish us the true text of the Word of God.

To group, to determine the value, to decide upon the age, and thus to determine the amount of importance to be attached to a single manuscript, or family of manuscripts, and thereby the value of a reading which may be found in them,—such is the proper work of Biblical critics. It will be seen, at a glance, that this must require a rare combination of attainments and qualities.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

There must be an accurate knowledge of the original languages in which the manuscripts are written, and of the antique forms of the letters, of the history of the times in which the manuscript originated or was employed, the forms of worship which were observed by the people among whom it appeared, the religious currents by which they were swayed, their peculiar type of thought ; all this, in addition to a deep spiritual insight, and a critical acumen of the highest order. But these are qualities and endowments which are not found in any man, or school, in their highest development and most harmonious union ; and so we must look to the combined labours of many scholars and many schools, working through many successive years, for our final text.

It is well known that many scholars were in doubt whether the work of examining, and sifting, and weighing existing materials had progressed far enough to warrant the issuing of a new recension of the Scriptures. This, however, will be determined when the new translation appears ; that this revision will be the final English translation, no one supposes ; that the translators will, however, so avail themselves of the materials already furnished and at their hand, as to make it a vast advance upon the present, we will not doubt, until the result shall prove the opposite.

The science of Biblical Criticism must be sharply distinguished from "Hermeneutics." The former, we must repeat, has to do merely with determining the text ; it separates the precious from the vile, the chaff from the wheat, the canonical from the apocryphal ; it removes everything which, from liturgies, doxologies, doctrinal bias, ignorance or mistakes of transcribers, or any other human source, may have, through the long ages, crept into the sacred text ; while, at the same time, its office is to insert in its proper place any word or particle which may have dropt out of it. The latter, "Hermeneutics," is a system of principles on which the text thus determined must be interpreted ; hence we have the "allegorical," the "mystic," the "historico-critical," and other systems of interpretation—*i.e.*, methods of dealing with the text which Biblical Criticism, as before defined, has furnished. The one asks, "What is the text ?" the other, "How shall we expound it ?"

It will be manifest what relations this science sustains to "Exegesis." The latter, as the word indicates, is the explanation or unfolding of the texts ; his subject-matter, and the principles which he must apply to it, are furnished to the exegete. His work is, not to determine the words, but the mind of the Spirit in the words. He may, however, discuss questions of criticism, and declare principles of interpretation. This is often necessary in order to justify his interpretation ; for, as his reading, so will be, of course, his explanation. His exposition will also depend largely upon his system of "Hermeneutics." The explanation of the allegorist will be the opposite of that of the literalist ; but, in discussing such questions, or stating such principles, he abandons the proper domain of Exegesis, and enters that of Biblical Criticism and Hermeneutics.

The relation of these three connected sciences to that which crowns

the edifice of Biblical learning, "Systematic Theology," is now easily determined. They furnish the material from which it erects its building. A text of Scripture, interpreted on true principles, has furnished the truth which the theologian builds into his structure; he deals with truth thus furnished, as the scientist with the facts of nature, arranges them in their logical order, shows their relation one to another, points out their mutual harmony, and their relation to that which is the central truth, or key to the whole. The critic furnishes the quarry, the exegete the stones; his is the architectonic genius that shapes them, and erects them into the temple of truth, radiant with the Divine glory, the final result and crown of Biblical studies.

It is not unusual for Biblical critics to undervalue Systematic Theology. This is not so much a logical inference from the greater progress that has been made in their favourite pursuit, as a result of that natural tendency of the human mind which leads it to undervalue the pursuits in which it is not interested, and, at the same time, unduly to exaggerate its own.

The changes hitherto made in the text are not such as materially to affect any one of the great fundamental truths embodied in the creeds and confessions of Evangelical Christendom. The forms in which these fundamental truths are cast change somewhat with the changes in thought and expression of each successive age, while, in essential character, they remain the same. The apostolical creed is still a synopsis of the faith of the true Catholic Church. Hodge and Van Oosterzee teach the great Pauline, Augustinian, Calvinistic theology of the Reformation period; they depart in no considerable point from the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Heidelberg Catechism. As it is no disgrace to our astronomers that they still teach the Copernican system of astronomy, for the simple reason that it is true, and they can teach no other, so it is no disgrace to our eminent theologians that they have not progressed beyond Paul and Augustine, as to fundamental truth. It would be a useless waste of time to run over these doctrines that have their place in the former creeds and confessions, and to show that they are to-day the accepted doctrines of the Church, with but little modification in form, and none in essence. They still stand the test of the famous maxim regarding "what has been held at all times, by all persons, and in all places." We may readily surrender as spurious, the statement in 1 John v. 7, regarding the three witnesses; yet this will not modify, much less shake, our conception of the doctrine of the Trinity. That doctrine rests upon too solid a basis of Scriptural affirmation and inference, and is too deeply embedded in the thought and consciousness of the Church, to be affected by the authenticity of a single passage. The being and attributes of God, the Fall, the Divinity of Christ, the nature of sin, the atonement, the resurrection, the glorification, &c., are all deducible from that great body of Scripture which is found even in the most imperfect of the manuscripts, and are not

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

likely to be in any considerable degree affected by the results of "Criticism."

It has been observed that the prevalence of Materialism is the indication of an age too weak or too indolent to think ; so we would consider indifference to Systematic Theology an evidence that men were either indifferent about, or incapable of, clear ideas and logical thought,—a sign of mental and spiritual decline in the Church. Happily, we do not discover any such symptom in the Presbyterian Church,—at all events, not in the United States. As a rule, Systematic Theology is the favourite department in all our seminaries ; it is still the Queen of the Sciences, and Biblical Criticism is a chief pillar of its throne. That some prefer another department of theological science is no reason why they should disparage those severer studies to which they have no inclination, or claim, for their own chosen department, a supremacy which does not of right belong to it. "Let the cobbler stick to his last."

There is but one way in which this science can affect Church government or worship—either, on the one hand, by proving certain passages, on which the advocates of any particular form have relied, to be spurious, or by proving genuine some passage which seriously affects the proposed view.

The High Church Episcopalian will be sure to claim a Divine warrant for his system, so long as he interprets the word *ἐπίσκοπος* by the functions of a modern bishop ; and the Presbyterian is hardly likely to forego his claim, so long as he believes "presbyter" and "bishop" to be synonymous terms, and finds, in the Pastoral Epistles, the officers, and substantially the courts, recognised in the Presbyterian system.

These are questions which are to be determined by exegesis, apostolical church history, and the application of principles which it may perhaps require much time to establish, so as to carry with them the weight of recognised authority. For instance, it seems not at all universally acknowledged that the Scriptures are of supreme and binding authority in all matters of government and worship, as well as of doctrine. Or, if this be admitted, then, upon the other hand, it is denied that they furnish any definite instruction upon these subjects.

That the Scriptures do furnish instruction upon these subjects we do most assuredly believe ; and that a careful, conscientious study will lead to such definite results, we as firmly believe. For these will be reached, not by losing ourselves in a mist, where no object can be clearly seen, and no voice distinctly heard, but by definite interpretations of words, which give a distinction of sound, and are not a mere voice.

There is observable, in certain quarters, a tendency to treat the Scriptures as though they were mere cloud-land—nothing settled, nothing defined ; a tendency which manifests itself in a nervous dread of clear and established principles. One would think, to hear persons under this influence, that the Bible was the most vague, instead of being the clearest book on earth ; and that to understand it in some general way

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

is the only attainment possible ; whereas it is the plainest of books—so plain that he who runs may read, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err therein. This tendency is at least increased by the dread that clear statements of Divine truth have a tendency to retard the progress of the Churches towards unity. But the very opposite is the fact, as has been forcibly shown by Dr. Shedd, in his admirable “History of Doctrine.” Real unity can come *only* through substantial agreement, and this can be attained only by clear and definite statement.

It is not clear to our mind that Biblical Criticism can in any way affect the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Although some speak as if it had laid that question at rest, no one pleads verbal inspiration for words other than those of the original autographs. It is the dignified office of “criticism” to furnish us with the very words of inspiration, and thus furnish us with the thoughts of inspiration—inspired thoughts, in the only way in which, according to our conception, they could be presented to us—viz., in inspired words ; but the question of inspiration is aside from its province, and must be decided by our views of the nature of inspiration, and of the connection between thought and expression.

This science settles no question as to inspiration ; it hands over to us the Word of God, and bids us form our views of inspiration upon other data than those which it furnishes. So far as it is concerned, we may hold to the mechanical or the dynamical theory of inspiration ; we may believe in verbal or non-verbal inspiration ; we may hold to degrees of inspiration, or believe that the Word of God is all equally inspired ; we may or may not make the distinction between revelation and inspiration. These are indeed important questions affecting our conception of the Word of God, but questions on which our science has nothing to say ; they must be determined upon other grounds, and through the use of other lights.

It appears almost superfluous to add that the Scriptures, as determined by the best scholarship, form our authoritative guide in all that relates to the doctrine, the worship, and the government of the Church. The Word of God is the supreme rule of faith and practice. Nothing which cannot be confirmed by its express declarations, or deduced from it by *legitimate inference*, has any authority, or can bind the conscience. If the Scriptural argument for any rite or custom is found inadequate, such rite or custom must be discarded, or take its place among “the things indifferent.”

It is vain to appeal to custom, in the absence of any Scriptural warrant ; indeed, such an appeal is of the very essence of Popery. Christ, the alone King and Head of His Church, possesses the sole authority to institute ordinances ; and to place them upon any other basis is an assumption of His prerogative.

Infant baptism, for example, must rest on the Scriptural argument ; unless it has such a basis, it is “will-worship,” a human device, a hollow mockery, and should be immediately abandoned ; the sooner, in that case,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

it falls into desuetude the better. The practice of the early Church is a presumptive argument in its favour, but nothing more. What saith the Scripture? How readest thou? To this standard we must come at last. We, of course, are not to be understood as affirming that nothing has Scriptural warrant but that for which we can cite the very words of Scripture; we have previously emphasised *legitimate inference*.

We have another example in the controversy between Presbytery and Episcopacy. Those writers on Episcopacy who admit that "bishop" and "presbyter" are, in the New Testament, synonymous terms, and who appeal from Scripture to the practice of the early Church—although the earliest practice is undoubtedly against them—appear to us to abandon the whole ground; if diocesan bishops are without Scriptural authority, they have no authority at all; theirs is a usurped prerogative. In fine, "Biblical Criticism" must determine the sacred text, Exegesis expound it, and its decisions, when clearly made, must be accepted as final.

The so-called "higher criticism" (or, more appropriately, "destructive criticism") of Germany appears, along with rationalism, out of which it arose, to have spent its fury, although its waves are still "casting up mire and dirt" on Britain and America; for, as Danton said, the waves will beat upon the shore long after the storm is down.

Even this criticism—rash, defiant, impious, and, in many instances, utterly baseless—has not been without its beneficial effects, as the destructive flood leaves a *residuum* of fertility upon the land over which it has swept.

The denial of the genuineness of any passage or passages, simply because they contained a miraculous narrative, or a clear prophetic declaration, was to assume an "*a priori* principle," false both in logic and in philosophy. These critics should first have proved the impossibility of the miraculous; but this would have been troublesome,—as they well knew, impossible. So it was the easier method to assume it.

It is well known to all Bible students how frequently some passage has been declared incorrect in the statement of some fact of history or science. But further investigation, or some new discovery, has confirmed the Biblical statement, and exposed the rashness and ignorance of the critic. The restoration, quite recently, of the name of Sargon, King of Assyria, to its proper place in history, as a result of the excavations of M. Botta, and the confirmation of the prophecies of Isaiah and Nahum regarding the destruction of "populous No" by the translations of the cuneiform writings, are among the more recent illustrations of this fact.

It is superfluous, however, to enter into detail; all persons who have the slightest acquaintance with the progress made in the study of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities, know in what a marvellous manner these long-buried records confirm the Bible history, and what fears of its friends, and hopes of its foes, they have served to dissipate.

The progress of science is at present tending to the same result. Recent investigations in Geology, in some instances, bring down the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

period of the existence of man on earth to little more than that indicated by the Usher Chronology. Our American astronomer, Newcombe, says of our globe:—"The latter has probably been revolving in its orbit ten millions of years; man has probably existed on it less than ten thousand years." Evolutionists to the front!

In concluding these remarks, it may be proper to notice, that, while Biblical Criticism is still a progressive science, we do not anticipate, as a result of its future advance, any considerable change in our views of the Scriptures, either as to their form or their fundamental teaching; the progress which we anticipate is rather in the line of fuller and clearer comprehension of the truths which they contain. We believe, with John Robinson, that "there is yet much truth to break forth from the Word of God," and hail with pleasure all efforts which assist us to a more assured conviction with reference to its subject-matter, and deeper and clearer conceptions of its meaning.

J. R. W. SLOANE.

METRICAL VERSIONS OF THE PSALMS.

AT the Reformation, a notable change, in respect alike of substance and of mode, was effected in the service of praise, as a part of public worship. The purifying and transforming spirit which brought about that mighty revolution, found here, as elsewhere, ample scope for its exercise. Except in Bohemia, where the exquisite tunes of the early Church had long been wedded to a vernacular ritual (an attempt to suppress which, made by the seventh Gregory, mainly because of the loud and general singing it encouraged, provoked a wearisome and resolute conflict that had much to do, eventually, with separating the national communion from Rome), the use of song in the sanctuary had, everywhere throughout Western Christendom, become woefully depraved. It was not congregational, nor devotional, nor scriptural, nor even natural. Of course, therefore, it was inartistic also; for truth and beauty, the essential elements of art, were lacking. Ordinarily, the "offices" of the Church were rendered in the most slovenly and irreverent fashion. Even the music of the mass was chattered or gabbled over in a style at the farthest remove from the genius and principle of that transcendent rite, and was such as to throw a mockery over the performance. Ditties of a questionable sort, set to roystering tunes, took the place of the authorised words and ancient voice of the Latin Church in her benediction hymns. In brief, degeneracy and corruption had proceeded as far in this department as in any other. As it was in respect of faith and rule, so it was in respect of worship.

A radical difference was established as regards the principle embodied in the service, and the immediate end to which it was directed. While

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

the Romish idea of music had come to be, and still continues, that of an influence tending to awaken devotional sentiments in those who hear, the Reformers thought of it as the meet effect and expression of such sentiments already existing. Whatever came short of this was deemed contrary to the just conception of religious worship. All the Reformers were at one on this point—Cranmer as heartily and thoroughly as any of them, though he was obliged to acquiesce in the introduction of what is known as the distinctively Anglican or "Cathedral" service, which is nothing else than an adaptation of the mode in which the offices of the Romish breviary are chanted in conventual and capitular churches.* To secure popular co-operation, and thus to revive congregational singing, it became essential that the simplest form of music—that of one note to a syllable—should be adopted. This necessity it was which gave a great impulse to the translation of the Hebrew psalms into metre. In an early number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, Professor Mitchell of St. Andrews illustrated the signal service which was rendered by Calvin in this field. To him all the Reformed Churches are largely indebted for his vigorous efforts to ensure that the praises of the great congregation should be sung with the understanding. To him, in a special degree, the Churches of the Presbyterian order owe it, that, in their ritual, those psalms which of old time daily thrilled from the vast chorus of singers through the temple courts at Jerusalem, and found an echo in the assemblies of the early Christian Church, were restored to that place of honour which they will ever retain. It may be worth while to note the leading steps in the course taken among English-speaking people to imitate his example.

A beginning had been made ere Calvin took up the task. Myles Coverdale, at some date prior to 1540, when he was exiled the first time, had translated thirteen of the psalms in metrical form. They were published along with a rendering of other "spiritual songes drawn out of Holy Scripture for the comforte and consolacyon of such as love to rejoyse in God and His Worde." In 1541, Sir Thomas Wyatt made his paraphrase of the seven penitential psalms. Immediately after the accession of Edward VI., there appeared a metrical version of nineteen psalms by Thomas Sternhold, Groom of the King's Chambers, with a dedication to the young monarch. In a short while, Sternhold doubled the number, and after his death the work was continued by John Hopkins, a clergyman in Suffolk, who, in 1551, published a revised edition, with seven additional psalms. About the same time, there appeared another collection, numbering twenty-two, along with sundry hymns, taken mainly from the *Gesangbuch* of Luther, as also rhymed versions of the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the

* In 1544, the Archbishop issued a "Letanie, with Suffrages to be said or songe." He took great interest in the preparation of a *Directorium Chori* after the appearance of the new Prayer-book in 1549; and he executed a cramped but faithful version of the Paschal hymn *Salve festa dies*, fitted to its appropriate melody.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Apostles' Creed, and several Scripture passages, some of them, like the prayer of Simeon and the acclaim of the Virgin Mother, being sacred songs, while others were hortatory or didactic. A third division contained, after a fashion prevalent in Holland and Italy,* a number of what may be called travesties of secular songs, the initial line, the measure, and the air being transferred to devotional compositions. The authorship of this work is credited to a Scot, John Wedderburn. Born of a distinguished family, he was settled as a priest in Dundee. He embraced the Reformed faith, and fled to Germany to escape the persecution of Cardinal Beaton. During the Marian troubles, Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who escaped capture, and was hid by his friends, occupied part of his abundant leisure in preparing a metrical version of the whole Psalter. It was published in 1557, with appropriate tunes, eight of which were by Tallis. Contemporaneously, the exiles at Zurich, Frankfort, and Geneva were making contributions to the amendment and completion of what had been done by Sternhold and Hopkins. The volume they produced soon distanced all rivalry in popular favour. In 1562, it was formally approved by Queen Elizabeth in Council. By royal proclamation, it was "set forth and allowed to be sung in all churches, of all the People together, both before and after Morning and Evening Prayer, and also before and after sermon." This was almost tantamount to an injunction that it should be used † and used it was universally, for a long period. It continued to be bound up with the Prayer-book till far on in the eighteenth century. Long ere that time, fault had been found with it as archaic and inaccurate. It kept its place, however, both in Church and meeting-house, despite many attempts to improve or supersede it. Among the churchmen who spent labour in vain on such efforts, were Patrick, afterwards Bishop of Ely, Richard Goodridge, and Simon Ford. Success was reserved for the smooth insipidities of Nicholas Brady and Nahum Tate, whose completed work was published in 1696. Its adoption was not carried without a severe struggle. A stout opposition was waged by many of the clergy, especially by Dr. William Beveridge, an able and influential divine, who maintained the superiority of the quaint and forcible rhymes of the Reformation epoch to the inane jingle which was brought into competition with them. ‡ The Nonconformists were not captivated by the weak and mechanical "smoothness" shown in the work of the Laureate and his colleague. They had, for the most part, rejected the version which obtained the sanction of the Westminster Assembly, though the revised form of it, approved by the Scottish Presbyterian Church, was recommended for use

* Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo de Medici, vol. i., p. 309.

† Trench, in his Select Glossary, says: "To 'allow,' from the French *allower*, and through it from the Latin *allaudare*, had a sense of praise or approval, which may now be said to have departed from it altogether."

‡ See a powerful "Defence of the Old Singing Psalms," in the first volume of his works, as collected by Horne.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

in the strongest terms by such men as Calamy, Manton, Mead, Owen, and Poole. When, however, Isaac Watts arose from among themselves to win by his "*Horæ Lyricæ*," his "*Hymns and Spiritual Songs*," and his "*Psalms of David Imitated*," the Johnsonian encomium of "doing better than others what no one has done well"—a judgment which, alike in its equivocal averment and its crafty qualification, is extravagantly unfair—they surrendered at discretion, and the old Psalm-book disappeared from the pews.

It was the Psalter of the Scottish Church for the space of a hundred years. It seems to have been carried north as soon as it was published. At first, there was of course no authoritative manual; and both in public worship and in private devotion, such renderings were chosen as the leader of the services preferred, or those present were familiar with. Thus, Knox, in his *History of the Reformation*, describing the conduct of George Wishart the night before his arrest at Ormiston, tells how, "after supper, he held comfortable purpose of the death of Godde's children, and mearely [merrily] said, 'Methinks I desyre earnestly to sleap,' and thairwith he said, 'Will we sing a psalm?' and so he appointed the 51st psalm, which was put in Scottish meter, and begane 'Have mercy on me now, good Lord.'" This is from a free paraphrase by Wedderburn. At a later date, Knox, describing the death of Elizabeth Adamson, mentions how she asked her sister to sing with her a psalm beginning "My saule, praise thou the Lord aluyes." This is the opening of the 146th, one of the first produced by Hopkins. Wedderburn's volume continued to be reproduced and circulated for many years. In the later editions, its third division was greatly enlarged. Dr. David Laing, who brought out a reprint of one issued in 1578, conjectures this was done under the superintendence of Wedderburn's younger brother.* In its final shape, this third part contained a strange medley of compositions. Some are grave and devout, strongly charged with spiritual fervour and passionate emotion. Some are daringly fantastic, though profoundly serious, reminding one of George Herbert's quaint moralisings, his forced conceits, and his affluence of subtle and weighty thought. One long piece, beginning "Grevous is my sorrow," a monologue supposed to be spoken by the Saviour, might find a niche in "the Temple," beside such a strain as "Was ever grief like mine?" To modern taste, however, the volume is disfigured and degraded by the unnatural association which links some of its pieces with the refrains of popular songs, and by the bitter invectives against Romanism which frequently carry others to pitiful depths of coarseness. They may have been efficacious in rousing and guiding opinion as regards the tremendous abuses they denounced, but it gives one a sense of relief to know that the book containing them never received, in respect even of its worthy and suitable parts, any formal ecclesiastical sanction. This was bestowed upon a revised ver-

* Preface to a "*Compendious Book of Psalms and Spiritual Songs*, commonly known as the Gude and Godly Ballates." Edinburgh, 1857.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

sion of Sternhold and Hopkins. While the English Privy Council were examining the volume, the Scottish General Assembly were engaged in the same task. They performed it with careful deliberation. An order of the Assembly for 1561 directs an advance of money to the printer employed, to put in type copies for the use of members. An Act of 1564 provides that every minister, exhorter, and reader should have and use a copy of the collection then finally approved. Forty-one of the psalms contained in it were different from those in its English prototype, a preference,—in most instances thoroughly well deserved,—being given to the later work of the Genevan exiles.

In connection with the ill-starred attempt, which speedily followed, to subvert the Presbyterian polity in Scotland, a vigorous effort was made to supersede the usage thus introduced. After the Hampton Court Conference, and while the happy suggestion of Dr. Reynolds for a revised translation of the Bible was being wrought out, it seems to have struck King James that he might win personal distinction by producing a new psalm-book. The idea was welcomed as a happy thought, and he gave himself to its fulfilment with an energy and patience he did not often exhibit. Conscious, perhaps, that he was but slenderly endowed with the divine afflatus, he associated with himself Sir William Alexander, afterwards Earl of Stirling, a poet of some note in his day. The earl's "*Recreations of the Muses*," a collection of heroic poems and tragedies, have long since fallen into deserved oblivion; but Thomas Campbell says "there is elegance of expression in a few of his shorter pieces." The part he bore in the literary partnership with his Sovereign cannot be determined. The joint performance was published after the King's death, in the King's name. It has some felicitous lines, but it is pervasively dull and cold, sometimes harsh and tuneless. Immediately afterwards, an edict appeared, ordering that it should be used in public worship throughout Scotland. Of course there arose stout demur. The reasonableness of the order was questioned; the authority to make it was denied. A pamphlet entitled "*Reasons against the Reception of King James's Metaphrase*," supposed to be by Calderwood, the ecclesiastical historian, did much to augment the hostility. There was no slackening, however, in the earnestness with which the objectionable volume was pressed. Whatever Laud may have thought of it, or of its fitness for the promotion of that "beauty of holiness" about which he was so fanatically zealous, he professed great earnestness in its recommendation. Shortly after Charles and he had visited Scotland, an injunction was passed "that no other Psalmes, of any edition whatever, be printed hereafter within that our kingdom, or be imported thither, either bound by themselves, or otherways, from any forrayne port." At the same time, there was bestowed upon Sir William Alexander, for thirty-one years, the exclusive privilege of printing the favoured volume. He took little by the gift. In three years his monopoly was spoiled. It fell with the overthrow of Episcopalianism by the famous Glasgow Assembly.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Still, there existed an earnest wish for a revised Psalter. It connected itself with a still more earnest desire for the attainment of that object which had been pled as an excuse for pushing the production of King James—uniformity of religion in the two kingdoms. In legislating for that great end, the Westminster Assembly did not neglect this minor matter. The English Parliament, by messages from both Houses, commended the subject to attention. The Peers accompanied their message, which was not delivered till October, 1645, with a good word on behalf of a version by William Barton, minister of St. Martin's, Leicester, to whom Cromwell gave the rectory of Cadeby, whence he was ejected in 1662. The Commons, who had moved almost two years before, proffered a suggestion in favour of one by Francis Rouse, a Cornish gentleman of good descent and estate, who sat in all the Parliaments of Charles I. as member for Truro, was Speaker of the Commons House in 1653, was then appointed Provost of Eton (where his portrait, in his Speaker's robes, may still be seen), and finally became one of Cromwell's Lords. His work had an advantage, not only in being brought under consideration first, but also in the fact that he was a member of the Assembly who gave diligent heed to its business, showing himself a capable and useful man. Besides, his translation was indisputably superior to Barton's. Not so much could be said of it very positively on a comparison with other two which were also brought into competition, though in rather a tentative style, and at a time which prevented them from getting all the justice they deserved. Principal Baillie was to blame for the delay. He had long desired a new version. He held strong opinions on the subject, matured during many conferences with Sir William Mure of Rowallan, who had composed a translation of which he thought highly. He would have liked to do Sir William a kind turn in the matter, but seems to have been restrained by his jealousy of Zachary Boyd, who had likewise prepared a version, which was in print. When it became known in Scotland how the business was going, the Commission sent a copy of Boyd's work to their representatives at Westminster, with instructions to submit it to the Divines. The Assembly, however, were by this time so far committed to Rouse. All three versions were used in the last careful revision to which his work was subjected, but a return was made to the order of the House of Commons, stating that "the Assembly hath caused the Psalms set forth by him to be carefully perused, and as they are now altered and amended do approve of them."* The Upper House made a further effort on behalf of Barton. The Assembly were asked "to certify to this House why these Psalms may not be sung in Churches as well as other translations." The reply was, that, were such liberty to be accorded, then "several translations might come to be used, yea, in one and the same congregation, which would be a great distraction and hindrance to edification."

* "Minutes of the Westminster Assembly," edited by Professor Mitchell and Dr. Struthers, p. 163. For a full and interesting account of the whole proceedings, see Appendix to Baillie's Letters, vol. iii., pp. 525-56.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

In January, 1646-7, Baillie brought down copies of the new Psalter, along with the Confession of Faith, as printed without proofs, which were presented by him to the Commission of Assembly. Much more time was spent upon the examination of the Psalter than upon that of the Confession. A committee of four, chosen because of their critical acumen and acknowledged taste, were set to canvass and amend it. Their report was transmitted to Presbyteries, while a new and more strict revision was carried forward. Next year this process was repeated. It was not till November, 1649, after an incredible amount of counsel, comparison, and correspondence, that a decision was arrived at. It was ratified by the Committee of Estates on the 15th of January; and, on the 1st of the following May, there was introduced that manual which has ever since been the praise-book of Scottish Presbyterians, and of their English-speaking co-religionists throughout the world.

The book is generally called Rouse's. But this assertion can only mislead. Three-fourths of its contents differ from anything Rouse penned. Several of its finest renderings have been taken from the older version. One instance is the magnificent 124th, "Now Israel may say, and that truly"—a strain to stir the heart like the sound of a trumpet, which, in 1582, was sung till "haevin and erthe resoundit" by thousands of Edinburgh people, who turned out in the High Street to welcome the return of their banished minister, John Dury. It is the work of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, a pillar in the congregation of Knox, at Frankfort, who had a chief hand in the translation of the Geneva Bible (remaining three years abroad after most of his compatriots, that he might finish the task), and who married Calvin's sister, Catherine. Another instance is the better known version of the 100th, which has a place in every collection meant for use by an English congregation, insomuch that it is given out by men so unlike and unallied as Mr. Voysey and Mr. T. T. Carter, Mr. Moncreu Conway and Mr. Mackonochie. It is the work of Whittingham's companion, William Kethe, a Scotsman, who shared Whittingham's opinions and employments during his foreign sojourn, remaining with him when the others left, and dying in France soon after the dispersion of the goodly fellowship. One could wish the process of substitution had been carried further. Sternhold's version of the 17th, for example, though rugged in certain parts, reaches, in some stanzas, a great pitch of sublimity. This is finer than what was taken—

"The Lord descended from above	and bow'd the heavens most high,
And underneath his feet he cast	the darkness of the skie;
On cherubs and on cherubims	full royally he rode,
And on the wings of mighty winds	came flying all abroad."

While the revisers took largely from what was old, they borrowed also very freely from what was contemporaneous. Here is how Rouse opens the first psalm :—

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

"The man is blessed that to walk
 In wicked ways doth feare,
 And stands not in the sinner's path,
 Nor sits in scorner's chaire."

The greatly superior version, which was accepted, is from the Rowallan MSS. The same is true of that exquisite psalm the 23rd—the first to be learned at a mother's knee, and often the last spoken in the dying ear. Rouse began it :—

"The Lord my Shepherd is. I shall
 Not want ; he makes me ly
 In pastures green, me leads by streams
 That do run quietly."

The corresponding lines in the accepted version, so vastly superior in melody and expressiveness, are by Zachary Boyd. All through, with unwearied patience, with nice discrimination, and for the most part with happy effect, the work of Rouse was corrected so as to bring it into closer conformity with the original, and to increase what was deemed its fluency and grace.

Very diverse opinions have been entertained as to the worth of what was done. By some, the performance has been made the subject of unsparing derision. It has been rated as mere doggerel. It has been pronounced cramped, sorry, uncouth, void of command over the resources of language, void also of true feeling for what it was sought to express, a caricature and degradation of the odes to which it is applied, an offence against all propriety. There are others to whom it is hallowed by associations which make it dear as a mother's grave, the sweet affections of home, or the clinging memories of infant scenes. They cannot hold it up at such a distance as will suit the focus of a callous critic's eye ; and, in so far, they are incapacitated for passing a true and independent judgment. Yet, alien prejudice and fond affection alike apart, there remains a decisive test. Let the question be asked—Who has done better ? and we wait in vain for a reply. Many have taken in hand to set forth in order with lyrical propriety these songs of Zion ; but where is the satisfactory achievement ? Take Watts. He acknowledges that he was fain to "omit several whole psalms, and large pieces of many others," recoiling before difficulties he could not overcome. Yet, apart from the tremendous impertinence which his principle led him to adopt—as when he turned the 67th psalm into a patriotic anthem of modern type, beginning "Shine, Mighty God, on Britain shine"—how limp, flaccid, and diffuse are even his finest efforts, when contrasted with the condensed vigour and the well-marked fidelity of the Scottish version. Or take still greater men, such as Milton. He had the ambition "to celebrate in glorious and lofty hymns the throne and equipage of God's Almightiness ;" but when he essayed the part of lyricist, and sung of Christ's Nativity, he produced an ode so prodigal of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

imagery, so rich in classic allusion, so full of conceptions foreign to devotion, as to make it wholly unsuitable for Christian worship. A few stanzas from his translation of the 136th psalm, composed while he was a schoolboy at St. Paul's, find a place in most hymn-books; but those which have been omitted are now generally allowed to be full of sounding redundancies, which,—whether his own, or, as some commentators have persuaded themselves, borrowed from Sylvester's translation of the French Calvinistic poet, the *Sieur du Bartas*,—have no propriety where they stand. Other translations were made by Milton in his riper years. Nine of them, done when he was forty, profess to be very literal. As printed, they show in italics all that differs from “the very words of the text, translated from the original.” Here, then, is a test as severe as could be applied to the Scotch version. It meets that test triumphantly. Let any one examine for himself, and he will be constrained to say, as regards these selected psalms, that the rendering of them in the Scottish book is by far the most clear, firmly-worded, harmonious, terse, and truthful. Take a couple of instances. The first is from Psalm lxxxiv. :—

MILTON.

“There even the sparrow, *freed from wrong,*
 Hath found a house of *rest* ;
 The swallow there, to lay her young,
 Hath built her *brooding nest* :
 Even by thy altar, Lord of Hosts,
They find their safe abode,
And home they fly from round the coasts
Toward thee, my King, my God.”

SCOTTISH VERSION.

“Behold, the sparrow findeth out
 An house wherein to rest ;
 The swallow also for herself
 Hath purchased* a nest ;
 E'en thine own altars, where she safe
 Her young ones forth may bring,
 O thou Almighty Lord of Hosts,
 Who art my God and King.”

The italics in the above are Milton's, according to his principle of showing how far he had deviated from his authority. Another example, from Psalm lxxxv. :—

MILTON.

“And now what God the Lord will speak
 I will *go straight* and hear,
 For to his people he will speak peace,
 And to his saints *full dear* ;

* “Purchased,” from the French *pourchaser*. In its primary and legal sense, to get by any means other than descent or hereditary right.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

To his dear saints he will speak peace ;
 But let them never more
 Return to folly, *but surcease*
To trespass as before."

SCOTTISH VERSION.

" I'll hear what God the Lord will speak :
 To his folk he'll speak peace,
 And to his saints ; but let them not
 Return to foolishness."

As great a man as even Milton tried this task. The prodigious mental activity of Bacon found recreation in the exercise. Into it he threw all his force of intellect and imagination, along with his rare command of concise and nervous English. He is to be found at his best in the 90th Psalm. Some of it may be cited, partly for that reason, and partly for comparison with a version by William Kethe, to whom the world owes the fine felicities of the Old Hundredth :—

BACON.

" O Lord, thou art our home, to whom we fly,
 And so hast always been from age to age,
 Before the hills did intercept the eye,
 Or that the frame was up of earthly stage,
 One God thou wert, and art, and still shalt be ;
 The line of time, it doth not measure Thee.
 " Both death and life obey thy holy lore,
 And visit in their turns, as they are sent ;
 A thousand years, with thee they are no more
 Than yesterday, which, ere it is, is spent ;
 Or as a watch by night that course doth keep,
 And goes, and comes, unawares to them that sleep."

KETHE.

" O Lord, thou hast bene our refuge,
 and kept us safe and sounde ;
 From age to age, as witnesse can
 all we, which true it founde,
 Before the mountaines were forth brought,
 yer thou the earth did'st frame ;
 Thou wast our great eternal God,
 and stil shalt be the same.
 " Thou dost vaine man strike downe to dust,
 'tho he be in his floure,
 Againe thou saist, ye Adam's sonnes,
 returne to shewe your power.
 For what is it a thousand yeares
 to count them in thy sight,
 But as a day which last is past,
 or as a watche by night ?"

Bacon's is undeniably beautiful and solemn, but it is only in a remote and derivative sense that it can be identified with what was indited by "Moses the man of God:" Kethe's is very simple, real, and true; but surely it is no mere trick of association that prompts a distinct verdict in favour of the common rendering? The comparison may be carried as far as any one pleases. Take whatever has been done by Sir Philip Sidney and his sister, by Sandys, by Wither, or, in later times, by Merrick, or Montgomery, or Keble (whose little-known "Psalter," in most respects a great failure, yet brings out, with the magic touch of a true poet, many minor beauties), or Lord Lorne (whose volume has much merit, as betokening sensibility, talent, and literary skill), lay it alongside the Scottish paraphrase, and decide in which there is most of combined strength and sweetness. The Scottish version may sometimes be "scabrous and hobbling" (to quote a phrase of Dryden's in the preface to his translation of Juvenal), but for the most part it is as superior to rivalry as the Latin renderings of George Buchanan or Arthur Johnston are to those of any modern Latinist. It always renders those psalms, which are best adapted for worship, with fidelity and vigour, sometimes with remarkable felicity and richness; while certainly no other translation is so widely known, has exerted an influence so beneficent, or is linked with so many sacred associations and blessed memories.

ROBERT GOSSIP.

SAMSON AGONISTES; OR, INDIVIDUALISM IN RELIGION.

"**C**ATHOLIC PRESBYTERIANISM" is a characteristic of the age. We live in times distinguished for vast combinations and alliances. The results achievable from united and concentrated action throw the value of individual effort into the shade. The giant warrior of heroic history has gone, and his place is occupied by imposing national armaments. The titled patron on whom the Johnsons and Goldsmiths of the day waited for encouragement and support in their literary labours has given place to the "general public" and the "million readers." The solitary coachman to whom entire provinces looked for news and conveyance has retired before "amalgamated companies" and railway monopolies. Even a skilled artisan cannot make a contract of labour for himself without previous consultation with the secretary of his "club." Government is only possible through organised partyism, and the peace of the world established or secured by political confederation.

And the same tendency to seek results by Œcumenical Councils, General Associations, United Church Societies, and the like, is equally noticeable in the religious world. The day has gone by for individual enterprise in the Foreign Mission field. The tragic fate of Richard Williams, the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

self-appointed missionary to the Tierra-del-Fuegians, was regarded as demonstrative of the folly or madness of isolated action. The work of evangelisation, if done at all, is to be accomplished through vast "Church Missionary" and other associations, aided by "British and Foreign" and "Trinitarian" Bible Societies, and supported by contributions from all the churches of Christendom. Thus only, it would appear, will "the little one become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation." Visibility has thus become not only a proof of existence, but, in ecclesiastical matters, an essential element of progress. Even Congregationalism has learned to centralise. Thus, too, "Catholic Presbyterianism" has become an accomplished fact, and gone forth to take its place for good or evil among the spiritual forces of the world.

While the eye of the Church, however, is thus attracted, gratified, dazzled with the results of these stupendous Catholic organisations, it is apt to overlook, or at least under-estimate, the value of individual effort. Living under the spell of such centralising forces, we are tempted to think disparagingly of personal, or even congregational action. What can one man do, or a solitary Church effect, in Home or Foreign Missions? "Your idea is no doubt a good one, your plan is excellent, your motive is commendable; but until you have enlisted the sympathy and secured the co-operation of others, we fear your views are Utopian and your method utterly unpractical." And so it happens, not unfrequently, that what is attempted is not what is wisest and most Scriptural, but what will secure the largest number of supporters—not what is best, but what is most popular. Truth is right in theory, and principle prevails in argument, but compromise and expediency catch more votes. Many are thus deterred from trying to carry out the purest and noblest purposes under the fear that popular sympathy may be against them, and that the ridicule which waits on failure may bring discredit on their cause.

Now, without seeking to undervalue the work resulting from combination of agencies, and the gains of federation, let us beware of forgetting an older experience of the Church, that God, by His Spirit, in the past, has done greater things by the few than the many. He has called fewer of the great and the mighty and the noble to His service than of the poor. "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings He has ordained strength." He allies Himself with the individual in preference to the multitude. He sent away Gideon's army, and retained only three hundred men, to whom He gave the victory. He put aside the Sanhedrim and Jewish priesthood, and made twelve poor fishermen His ambassadors to the world. He did great things by Luther and Zuingli and Knox. In our own day, has He not stirred and quickened the spiritual life of the churches in Britain and America, and added many to His kingdom, by two simple-hearted evangelists that no Mission Board or Church Association has recognised? It is not by might, nor by power. Is He not thereby teaching us that Samson-like men and Samson-like work are still possible in these latter days, and that no force, or com-

bination of forces, can equal the prowess of that man who is "strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might" ?

Samson was a child of promise, and a Nazarite from his birth. "And the woman bare a son and called his name SAMSON" (sun-like) ; "and the child grew, and Jehovah blessed him. And the Spirit of Jehovah began to move him at times in the camp of Dan between Zorah and Eshtaol" (Judges xiii. 24, 25). He was a man, it would appear, of dauntless courage, with a certain rugged strength of arm and character, of capricious temper and inflexible will. His exploit with the lion at Timnath, the slaughter of his enemies at Ramath-lehi—where with an ass's jaw-bone he slew a thousand men,—and his night march from Gaza to Hebron with the city gates upon his shoulders, afford us glimpses of his warrior-build and his wild and rugged ways. In early youth, he loved and married a daughter of the Philistines ; and afterwards, on her death, he took another to wife, the now famous Delilah ; and in these ill-advised and unholy alliances he paved the way for his humiliation, and untimely but heroic death. *What God can accomplish for His people by a single arm* is the short but emphatic lesson of his life-history.

Wherein, let us ask, *did* this man's "great strength" lie ? Stripped a little of mystic symbolism, the answer will be, *In his entire consecration to Jehovah.*

He had been "a Nazarite" from his birth. No razor had ever come upon his head. The chief member of his body—his head—that is to say, his entire manhood—had been dedicated to God's service. Therein lay his strength : Samson was not his own. Not in bone and muscle, not in sinew of limb and shoulder, but in the absolute surrender of mind and will, in unconditional readiness to carry out the Divine behests, lay the might of this peerless champion who rescued Israel from the Philistines. So it is ever. Just in proportion to the degree of consecration will be the extent of our spiritual influence and success. We are weak in the ratio of what we reserve. The part we keep back is the element of danger. Achilles is said to have been dipped in the fabled Styx by his mother Thetis, all save the heel by which she held him ; and it was there he received his mortal wound. Had Samson's heart followed his head in the dedication-vow, and religion held the place which the daughters of Philistia so easily captured, he had not fallen at last a victim to his weakness and folly. Give up little for Christ, and you will accomplish little ; give up much, and you will have proportionate success ; give up *all*, and you will have a greater than Samson's success, and be "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." Those who have done most for Christ in the world are the apostles who could say, "Lord we have left ALL and followed Thee." And He who redeemed the world, and spoiled the principalities and powers of the Enemy, achieved His victory by saying, "Not my will, but Thine be done."

Again, *Samson did the particular work which God assigned him.*

His power seems to have been mainly, if not entirely destructive. In

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

many respects it may be described as rough, violent, and even repulsive work. Beating in human skulls with an ass's jaw-bone was, in itself, certainly neither desirable nor very enviable employment. Pulling down, in one herculean wrench, Dagon's temple on its festal day, and burying its lordly worshippers, with himself, beneath its ruins, was one of the sternest acts of retribution which any human arm had been commanded to inflict. Yet the hero flinched not. God's work, such as it was given him, he did with his might. He had been commissioned, as a minister of Divine justice, to execute long-deferred and richly-merited vengeance on those idolatrous oppressors of the chosen people, and what the highest angel before the throne would have done without question or misgiving, Samson undertook and faithfully and uncomplainingly accomplished. How many fail here! Numbers of the Church's most zealous servants fall short of the object of their life-mission because they will attempt that for which they have not been qualified, and run where they have not been sent. Had Samson turned his great powers to sheep-farming, to vineyard-dressing, to music, or psalm-writing, or temple-building, he had unquestionably failed. He did single-mindedly, and with his entire strength, the particular work for which he was appointed, and for which he was divinely gifted, and God crowned him with success. Had Mr. Moody, on his late mission to this country, charged himself with the music, the organ, and solo-singing, while Mr. Sankey preached the Gospel, it would have needed no prophet to predict for both a speedy and ignominious failure. But next to entire consecration of heart and life to their Master's service, the secret of the "great strength" of these honoured brethren—for Samson-like in many respects it was—lay in each doing the special work for which he was adapted and called. And not otherwise shall any man, or Church, succeed in the grand objects of their mission. The pastor or teacher whose work lies chiefly among believers and their households, the evangelist whose office limits him mainly to the unconverted and unsaved, the elder, deacon, precentor, has each his department of service assigned him in the Church; each has the gifts and grace requisite for its accomplishment, each will succeed best by confining himself to the duties of his particular office, and each shall "receive his own reward according to his own labour."

The charge of having a "*one-man ministry*" is inapplicable to the Presbyterian Churches. Perhaps the time has come for a stricter definition of the distinctive duties of the pastor and the evangelist,—of the occasions when a minister of the Word should "*discourse*" (διαλέγεσθαι), like Paul at Troas, at the Lord's table; when he is called to "*preach the Gospel*" (εὐαγγελίσασθαι) to the unconverted; and when, breaking new ground, as a missionary, he becomes a "*herald of the kingdom*" (κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν). But, with such-like small exceptions, the office-bearers of our Churches now,—elders who rule, and those of them who rule and teach, teachers (professors?), evangelists, and deacons,—do precisely the work such men appear to have done in the days of the Apostles.

And Samson-like men, and Samson-like work, this divinely organised and Scriptural "system," in past ages, has developed. Whatever may be said of the principle of universal ministry, or "every one his own minister," it has yet to show that it is capable of producing the equals of the stalwart men of old. The principle of setting apart, by Scriptural "ordination," such as have been divinely gifted and called to the office, for the exercise of their special powers in expounding the Scriptures and preaching the Word, though now so boldly challenged, has unquestionably been prolific of Samson-like progeny. To recall the names of Paul and Barnabas, of Athanasius and Chrysostom, of Howe, Baxter, Rutherford, and Matthew Henry, and, in our own times almost, of Edwards and Hodge, Chalmers, Macleod, and Guthrie,—is to be reminded that there have been "giants in the earth in those days." The characters and destinies of nations have been moulded in their hands. The rights and liberties of the entire Church have been upheld and advanced by them. The temples of superstition, idolatry, and mammon-worship have had their pillars shaken by their warrior-arms. And many city-gates, "bar and all," that hindered the progress of the Gospel at home and abroad, have been by them lifted from their hinges and borne off in triumph. In this they have succeeded chiefly because they consecrated their individual gifts to the special work assigned to them.

If it be not stretching analogy too far, I would add that yet another element in Samson's "great strength" lay in *fighting with the weapon with which God furnished him*.

I have no doubt that the young warrior felt somewhat ashamed at first to use so unsoldier-like an implement as an ass's jaw-bone. More to his mind, and readier to his hand, had been a keen Damascus blade, or the heavily-handled spear or javelin of those times. But there was neither time nor occasion for arming himself otherwise than with the instrument which God had provided for him. Accordingly, he takes it on trial, and not only finds it marvellously adapted to the emergency, but, when the battle was over, out of a little hollow in the bone there came water to quench his burning thirst. It dealt death to his enemies, and ministered refreshment and life to himself. So he called it ENHAKKORE, "the well of him that cried" (Judges xv. 19). Notice how like an *accident* the finding of this jaw-bone appeared to be. Yet God in His Providence had placed it there, "a present help in trouble." When Robert Barclay, crippled in his argument with his German guide over the Alps, lamented that he had not brought a copy of the Scriptures in that language, and suddenly discovered a *German Bible* in the snow at his feet, which some previous traveller had dropped, he was, no doubt, right, with his companion, in regarding it as a voice from heaven.* God furnishes His warriors for the battle with such weapons as they require, and makes them, besides, to "drink of the brook in the way, that they

* "Memoir of Robert Barclay," of the Society of Friends. Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1878.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

may lift up their heads." So with Augustine and his *Confessions*, Luther and his *Theses*, Wycliffe and his *translated Bible*, Pascal and his *Letters*, John Newton and his *Hymns*, John Bunyan and his *Pilgrim's Progress*. Their weapons were pointed out to them; furnished from the Divine armoury, perfectly adapted for the work of attack or defence, and means of comfort and strength to themselves in the hour of greatest need.

And is it not thus that the GOSPEL—the stumbling-block to the Jew and the foolishness to the Greek—becomes, to those who accept and preach it, "the power and wisdom of God"? To human wisdom, the story of the cross is foolishly simple: it requires no skill to tell it, no philosophy to comprehend it. Yet with this apparently foolish weapon, and that only, its preachers have conquered cities, nations, kingdoms; overthrown the most gigantic systems of superstition and idolatry; and bid fair, even according to human probability, to convert "the kingdoms of the world into kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ." There is a "well," too, in the weapon which we may call *Enhakkore*, "the well of him who cries," or preaches it. "The joy of the Lord is our strength," as His strength is our joy. The faith, love, zeal, and courage of the preacher are all strengthened by the work. Like Samson's weapon, a new or "moist jaw-bone," the story is always fresh.

The words of men grow old:
They lose their taste and power;
But Thy sweet words, O Jesus Christ,
Are life for evermore.

Moody and Spurgeon are doing Samson-like work even now, armed with this alone.

And *Samson was prepared to die for his cause*. "And Samson said, let me die with the Philistines. And he bowed himself with all his might; and the house fell upon the lords, and upon the people that were therein. So the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life" (Judges xvi. 30). This was Samson's greatest feat of strength, his grandest and most heroic achievement. He gave up his life to accomplish the object on which he had set his heart, and succeeded beyond all he had yet accomplished. And until each servant of Christ has reached this point, when "zeal for God's house consumes him," when body, soul, and spirit are laid upon the altar "a whole burnt-offering unto God," until he is prepared to give up his entire life for, and, if need be, to die in the service, he will fall short of the Samsonian stature, and the success of the great Hebrew's life. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground *and die*, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." So spake the Captain of our salvation, in view of His sacrifice and the glory that would follow. So each of His followers must speak and act if he would reach the "chief end of man." "Neither count I my life dear unto myself, that I might finish

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." Paul, too, did Samson-work, and died a martyr to his zeal in the pulling down of strongholds. Nor was it till Luther and Knox were prepared to die for their cause that the work of the Reformation began to make headway against Papal Rome. When the foreign missionary takes his life in his hands, and is prepared, like Livingstone, to leave his bones in the lands for which he prays, his cause begins, and only then begins, to triumph. The service of Christ demands our all. The last hour as well as the first of the new life must be dedicated to Him. And the reason why there are so few Samson-like men, and so little Samson-like work in the Church to-day, is, that we fall so far short of his spirit of self-sacrifice.

R. BALGARNIE.

THEOLOGIANS OF THE DAY—LUTHARDT.

LEIPZIG, one of the busiest of German commercial towns, the centre of the book-trade of the world, with its renowned battlefield where the great "battle of the nations" was fought in which the power of the first Napoleon was broken, has many attractions for the theological student from England or America, and presents an aspect of German life with which it is advantageous to come into contact. Its theological faculty includes Kahnis, Luthardt, Lechler, and Delitzsch. Of these, Luthardt and Delitzsch are known through their translated works to a wide circle of English readers. In this article we are to speak of the former.

Christoph Ernst Luthardt was born at Maroldswesach, in Lower Franconia, on the 22nd March, 1823. He received his early education at Nuremberg, and, from the year 1841 to 1845, was a student of theology at Erlangen and Berlin. In 1847, he became teacher in the Gymnasium at Munich. He looked forward, however, to a university career, and devoted himself with diligence to his favourite study of theology. The university system of Germany, not only by the numerous openings which occur in the ranks of its professoriate, but by its encouragement of competitive, and what we would call extra-mural lecturing, affords opportunities which are sought in vain in the less comprehensive and elastic organisations of Scotland, and makes success all but a certainty to patience, industry, and capacity. A licentiate of any of its faculties may obtain a university recognition as a *Privat Dozent* or Lecturer, and may then, according to his success, and on vacancies occurring, mount the remaining steps of the ladder, and become Extraordinary, and finally Ordinary, Professor. In 1852, Luthardt became *Privat Dozent* at Erlangen, where he had entered as a student eleven years before. In 1854, he received an appointment as Extraordinary Professor of Theology at Marburg, and at Easter, 1856, he

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

removed to Leipzig, to occupy the Ordinary Professorship of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, which he still retains. In 1865, he obtained the title of *Consistorialrath*, becoming thus a member of the Supreme Official Council of the Lutheran Church.

Professor Luthardt's theological position is easily definable. He is the representative of strictly orthodox evangelical Lutheranism. He belongs to the so-called Erlangen School, a school marked not more by its firm adherence to Confessionalism, than by the fervent and practical character of its piety. He has not identified himself, as so many German theological writers have, with the tenets of any philosophical school, and with the attempt to solve the difficulties of faith by the subtleties of metaphysics. He accepts the traditions of his Church intelligently and reverently; in his hands, tradition remains no collection of dry bones, but is illustrated from the resources of a singularly careful and comprehensive culture in science, philosophy, and literature, and is made to glow with the ardour of profound personal conviction. As a lecturer, Luthardt is popular and instructive; as a preacher, he takes rank among the most impressively eloquent of German divines. His tall figure, a thoughtful, and (in repose) somewhat sad face, the expressive curves of the mouth, a habit of tossing back, from his ample forehead, his dark grey hair, which is worn somewhat long, his graceful gesture, and deep sonorous voice, contribute materially to the effective delivery of lecture or sermon.* In private, his manner is somewhat reserved; he lacks the voluble frankness of some of his colleagues. He is emphatically a student; yet he is a keen observer of the life passing around him, and in the public business of the Church and of the University he takes a very considerable interest. He is recognised as the leader of Lutheranism in Saxony, and, as the editor of a weekly ecclesiastical journal, he wields great influence.

His reputation, however, largely rests upon his theological writings. We have already mentioned that several of these have been translated into English. Among them is his chief exegetical work,—“St. John's Gospel described and explained according to its peculiar character.” It was first published in 1853. A second edition was issued in 1875, in which various modifications were introduced to bring it more into accordance with the author's later and more matured conception of his great subject. The modifications especially affect the expository portion of the work, which is expanded so as to form considerably the larger portion. But still, it is in the Introduction that the special features and value of the book are found. This includes a minute and careful discussion of the language of the gospel, in its grammatical, rhetorical, and mental characteristics; also a consideration of the elements of the narrative,—the various characters portrayed, such as Thomas, Nathanael, Peter, the Mother of Jesus, Caiaphas, Pilate,—the progress of the history,—and the nature of the discourses of Jesus recorded by St. John, which

* The personal description is from a recollection of some nine years ago.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

form so prominent a feature in his gospel, and have given rise to so much discussion. He divides the narrative into three parts, having as their respective headings,—“Jesus the Son of God,” “Jesus and the Jews,” “Jesus and His own.” Of this work, Dean Alford remarks,* that “it is a most valuable contribution to the right understanding of our gospel ;” having used it “during a continuous pulpit-exposition of the earlier part of St. John,” he “ever found more and more reason to value it ;” he speaks of “the many striking ideas suggested” in the Commentary, though he regards the views of this “earnest and delightful writer” as “sometimes overwrought.” It is from the second edition that the English translation† has been made. The special question of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel has been treated by Luthardt more at length in a separate work, also translated.†

Next in interest and importance to his “Commentary on St. John” will probably be ranked his three volumes of “Apologetic Lectures” on the Fundamental, the Saving, and the Moral Truths of Christianity respectively. Each contains ten Lectures, and each Lecture is accompanied by a large amount of illustrative matter in the form of Notes, consisting of references to, and selections from, all departments of literature. The first volume deals with the questions which lie at the root of all religion, and which concern the position of Christianity in a general view of the world and of history. The attitude assumed is clear and definite. One fundamental thought pervades the book. It is, says Luthardt, “the thought of my life,”—that the contest is between “two views of the world,” and that it is “the task of the advocates of the Christian view to show, in the presence of modern thought, and by the resources of modern intellectual culture, that it, and it alone, is the satisfactory solution of the problem of all existence, of human life and its enigmas, of the human heart and its inquiries.” “The choice of the premise,” as Godet strikingly remarks,‡ “depends upon moral liberty ; it is at this starting-point that the friends of light and those of darkness separate from each other ; the rest is only a matter of logic.” These two views Luthardt thereupon endeavours to set forth in their antagonism, meeting and explaining, by reference to it, every objection or difficulty that may be urged. It is upon this broad ground that he prefers to decide all questions. The perplexities which surround any one of these he shows to belong to the general system. The two views of the world, though mutually exclusive, cannot finally disprove each other ; here it is, therefore, that the moral element comes in. But, having adopted one or other, we are bound to show that it satisfies all the conditions, and affords a satisfactory solution to every problem. Feeling that the discussion of separate points would be endless, we are to concentrate

* “Gr. Test.” i. (6th edition) p. 62 n. He saw, of course, only the first edition, that of 1853. Dean Alford died in 1871.

† Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark.

‡ “Comm. sur l’Evangile de St. Jean” (1re ed.), i., p. 264.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

our attention upon the answer to be given to the decisive and all-inclusive question—Is God or the world to be the principle and centre of all things, and consequently of our reasoning? “The prerequisite, however, and determining motive of different opinions, is not so much a different philosophy, a different set of notions, as a different state of feeling. It is the inclination and tendency of the heart which finally determines the opinions of the mind. For, an opposite course of life must result, according as a man finds his satisfying portion in the world, or in the personal and living God.”* To this final form such questions as creation, miracle, and revelation, are, in turn, reduced. If Materialism and Pantheism be rejected, “if God is a living and personal God, then the world was made by Him, and creation was a free act of His power, wisdom, and love.”† The difficulties raised from the side of physical science disappear before this great solvent. In his views of the bearing of science, Luthardt goes further than many perhaps would be inclined to follow him; as, for example, when he seeks to rebut the objection that Christianity makes this world the centre of the universe, whereas it is in reality “one of the smallest satellites of one of the least important suns.” He urges that “no other body of our system is so adapted as the earth, to be the abode of organic life,”‡ and thus virtually negatives the probability of the other planets and systems being inhabited. Dealing with the question of revelation, he says there is but one valid objection to its possibility, and that is—There is no God; “to those, however, who believe in a living and personal God, the possibility of revelation is but the simple result of His existence.”§ Similarly, “we must deny God Himself, if we deny that He can work miracles.”|| Thus, a decision of the fundamental problem in favour of Theism is found to involve the acceptance of Christianity as a system of Divine truth, and the person of Jesus Christ as the object of revelation, the reconciler of the “contrasts, God and man, holiness and sin, heaven and earth,”¶ the solution of “the enigma of existence.”¶

At this point the argument is taken up by the second volume, “On the Saving Truths of Christianity,” which deals with the questions springing out of the contents of the Christian revelation, and grouped around the doctrines of sin and grace. The Incarnation, the Atonement, the Trinity, are successively discussed as the great features in the Divine plan for the salvation of the world; then the Church, as “the organism of religion;” the Holy Scriptures, as the record of revelation; the Word and Sacraments as the Church’s means of grace; and the Last Things as the goal of the Church’s effort. Each of these subjects is expounded and illustrated from history and literature, and the objections to it are briefly, but skilfully refuted. It is in this volume that the Lutheranism of its author naturally comes most clearly into view. Thus, with regard

* “Fundamental Truths,” p. 25. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.)

† *Ibid.*, p. 73.‡ *Ibid.*, p. 91.§ *Ibid.*, p. 192.|| *Ibid.*, p. 194.¶ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

to the Lord's Supper, he says :—"Our Church believes itself obliged to take Christ's words as they stand, and as St. Paul understood them when he said : The bread is the communion of the body of Christ, the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ—that is to say, that the reception of bread and wine is the reception of the body and blood of Christ." * And again, " We do not stand in a merely spiritual fellowship with Him ; it is a complete one ; it is not merely the virtues of His Divine nature which we receive, it is also in His human nature that he gives Himself to us." †

The third volume, "On the Moral Truths of Christianity," traverses, in a popular, but necessarily imperfect and fragmentary way, the wide and important field of Christian ethics. The individual, the family, and the social life are traced in bold and vigorous outlines, as they *should* be, under the modifying and regulating influence of religion. The last two chapters upon "Culture and Christianity," and "Humanity and Christianity," are specially worthy of attention, as they present a side on which the ethical implications of Lutheranism are probably superior to those of Calvinism. The Lutheran Church did not break so completely with art, science, and other elements of human culture, as the Reformed Churches ; it did not drive the representatives of culture into antagonism to itself, but endeavoured to embrace these elements within the compass of its sacramental and mystical system. Christian ethics has long been a favourite field of investigation with Professor Luthardt. It forms one of his annual courses of lectures to his students ; and, if we may trust the indications afforded by a little book, "The ethical system of Luther," published in 1867, the ground-work of his system seems to have sprung from a minute and loving study of the great Reformer's works. The admirable divisions of the subject found in the volume on Moral Truths appear, in germ, in the headings under which he arranges the moral teaching of Luther.

Dr. Luthardt is joint author, with Kahnis and Brückner, of a book on "The Church : its Origin, its History, and its Present Position," which has also been translated.

Of his untranslated works, perhaps the most important are two monographs upon Christian doctrines, the one treating of "Free-will, and its relation to Grace ;" ‡ and the other of eschatology, or "The Doctrine of the Last Things." § The former traces the history of opinion concerning Free-will in the Greek and Latin Churches, and more at length as it appears among the theologians and theological schools of the Lutheran Church. The thirteenth chapter investigates the Scriptural doctrine on the point, and the fourteenth draws the dogmatic conclusion, which is naturally a defence of the Lutheran position as to the resistibility of grace, and the significance of the sacraments, especially of baptism, for the moral life of the Christian.

* "Saving Truths," p. 244.

‡ Leipzig, 1863.

† *Ibid.*, p. 245.

§ 2nd ed. ; Leipzig, 1870.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

In the second book mentioned, Luthardt translates and briefly expounds the Revelation of St. John, prefixing a general discussion of the problems concerning the end of the world, and an exposition of the various other passages of the New Testament which have been understood as referring to it. His main position may be expressed in the passage quoted by Dr. Hodge: * "That the Revelation of John does not contemplate the events of history, whether of the Church or of the world. It contemplates the end. We find that the antagonism of the Church and the world, and the issue of the conflict are its contents; the coming of Christ is its theme. The events of history preceding the consummation are taken up only so far as they are connected with the final issue. This consummation is not chronologically unfolded, but is ever taken up anew, in order to lead us by a new way to the end."

One of the greatest services which Professor Luthardt has rendered to the student has been the preparation of his "Compendium of Dogmatics," † which is a perfect marvel of condensation. By means of close though clear printing, and the use of contractions wherever it was possible consistently with intelligibility, he presents us, in a small octavo volume of 300 pages, with an amount of material which we may look for in vain in works of much greater size and pretensions. The introductory portion includes an excellent and useful outline of the history of dogmatic theology. Each section of the book is preceded by a very full and valuable bibliographical list. Then we have a clear statement of the particular doctrine, in a brief, large-print paragraph; while succeeding paragraphs deal with the teaching of Scripture and the teaching of the Church upon the point. The authorities, whether Scripture, Greek or Latin Fathers, or mediæval writers, are always quoted in the original. The Compendium is thus a library in itself, and must represent the toil of many laborious years.

Besides the "Ethics of Luther," already mentioned, Luthardt has published several lectures and pamphlets, notably one on the "Modern Delineations of the Life of Christ," an effective criticism of the Rationalistic position of Strauss, Renan, and Schenkel. He has also been a frequent contributor to the "*Erlanger Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*."

Not a little of Luthardt's popular influence is due to his sermons. Of these, five volumes have been published, under the titles of "The Grace of God in Jesus Christ," "A Testimony concerning Jesus Christ," "The Word of Truth," &c. German sermons are rarely marked by original thought, learned or subtle exposition, or graceful and eloquent language. The system of preaching, for the most part, from the epistle or gospel for the day, leaves little scope for the display of these qualities. They are usually, however, clear, earnest, popular, and

* "System. Theol.," iii., p. 827.

† Leipzig, 1865. 4th ed., 1873.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

practical. We may take as a fair specimen of Luthardt's style one or two extracts from an Advent Sermon on Luke i. 67-75.*—"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people," &c. The introduction is as follows:—

"Beloved, there is a threefold history, both in the case of the world and of individual men. The first has its origin in the heart of man, the second in the heart of God, in the third we experience the blessed fellowship of both. In the first, that which is in man is made manifest: the rich gifts of intellect with which God has endowed human nature, the capacity of appreciating that which is lofty and noble, which He has set in man's breast; but also the discord and unrest, the hatred and all evil dispositions which lurk and abide in the dark background of the human soul, and make the earth a place where sins reign and passions contend. We meet with the best example of this history in the time of those great and richly-endowed peoples before Christ, in whom the unaided powers of man attained their fullest development. But the end was bankruptcy, moral and spiritual bankruptcy. The better of them mourned over virtue and shame alike departed; while those of deeper insight declared, There is no Truth. The highest truth was to long after truth, and the worthiest morality the acknowledgment of weakness and the yearning after a higher power; and the result of the whole history before Christ is expressed in the well-known utterance of the heathen philosopher—'Men cannot attain to the gods, the gods must descend to men.'

"The second history is that which has its origin in the heart of God; its fruit is the Divine treasure of our salvation. This advanced side by side with the other. But, while the first filled the earth, this was confined to a narrow space. While the first ruled the speech of the time, this pursued its silent way. But in the secrecy of silence it prepared the salvation of mankind. Ere men had awakened from the dream which they were dreaming, the Divine grace had already prepared its gifts, and now called the nations to receive them. And its highest gift is the grace and love of God itself. For, in it, that which is in God is made manifest, namely, the gracious and merciful love of His heart. Out of this fulness we should receive grace for grace. Step by step God has come down, ever nearer to men, until it was said—He is become as one of us.

"The first history may be compared to a man who stretches out his hands in prayer towards heaven, while his eyes seek there to behold the God of Truth. The latter history is God Himself, who stretches forth His hands towards men in love, while His eyes seek out the strayed. In the former case, it is as in Job (xxiii. 8), 'Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him; he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him.' Here, on the other hand, it is: 'And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.'

"Its aim, however, is, that man should suffer himself to be found of God, his heart to turn towards God's heart, and be made one with it. How God goes after us and leads us back, how He overcomes us, and pours out His love in us, how

"Das Heil in Christo Jesu," s. 1.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

He forms a blessed heart-union between Himself and us,—that is the history which has since been accomplished in the Church, and should accomplish itself in us. That which has taken place is what God's love has done for our salvation ; it is brought near to us that it may also become the deed of our souls, and be realised in us. The Word is made flesh, that He may also become in *us* flesh and blood. The Lord has come to earth that He might also come in *us*. He has visited and redeemed His people, that He might also visit and redeem us, and win us for His people. We should so think of the great things that God has done, that they may be repeated in ourselves ; we should so celebrate the advent of the Lord, that it may become an advent for us also, that the history of the past may be repeated in the present, and that what the Scripture has recorded may be, for us and in our experience, life and reality."

The subject of the sermon is, "The Revelation of God in Christ the Goal of the Ancient and the Starting-point of the New Time," and the division is twofold, corresponding with the title thus announced. The conclusion is :—

"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel ; for He hath visited and redeemed His people. What we need, what we ought to long for, is long ago made ready. He *hath* visited and redeemed His people. That is our joyful Advent cry. He came for us all, the Lord ; He also came to us all, the Saviour. Are we not baptised ? baptised with the Holy Spirit, which He has richly shed upon us ? Have we not received the body and blood of the Lord ? given for thee, shed for thee, for the remission of sins ? Have we not absolution ? Thy sins are forgiven thee ; go in peace. Have we not in a thousand ways received and experienced the grace of God ? Is He not our Father, are not we His children ? Why do we still doubt, what do we still seek, as though we needed to work it out ourselves ? It *is* done, it *is* accomplished. Oh, believe it only, and rejoice therefor, and thank Him for His grace, and praise His name. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people. He is mine, and I am His. That is the salvation, this blessed union of hearts. I desire no more, I need no more. That is all and more than enough to make me blessed and joyful. Thou art mine, because I hold thee, and suffer thee not, O my Light, to leave my heart. That is the blessed gift of the Advent.

"And the task that it lays upon us ? 'That we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life.' God help us all to praise Him by our life, to serve Him by our work, to keep all our thoughts pure and holy before Him, to be joyfully submissive to His will, till at last, free from all that here burdens us,—above all, fully freed from ourselves,—we shall serve Him in gladness and holiness in the future world, when the last Advent of Christ, which we look for, announces the full day of salvation, and we then greet Him who comes, with the praise of the redeemed : Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people ! Amen."

These extracts will show, better than any words that can be added to them, in what spirit Professor Luthardt pursues his work. His great talents and scholarship, his unwearied industry, are consecrated to the service of God and the advancement of His kingdom among men. In

all his teaching, he sets before him the example and the spirit of the Master.

“Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.”

ALEXANDER STEWART.

RECENT EPISCOPALIAN WRITERS ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

IN a recent number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*,* reference was made to the approval, by Dean Stanley, of the views regarding the form of Church government in apostolic times, expressed by Dr. Lightfoot, the Bishop of Durham—so well known for his scholarly commentaries on the Epistles to the Galatians, Philippians, and Colossians, and more recently, for his thorough and conclusive refutation of the leading statements in “Supernatural Religion.” We propose to make a few quotations from the bishop’s commentary on the Philippians, in which the subject is very fully and fairly discussed,—merely reminding our readers that the great point in dispute between Episcopalians and Presbyterians is, whether the office of a “bishop” is distinct from, and superior to, that of a presbyter, or not, rather identical with it.

At p. 93, Dr. Lightfoot states :—

“It is a fact now generally recognised by theologians of all shades of opinion, that, in the language of the New Testament, the same officer in the Church is called indifferently ‘bishop’ and ‘elder’ or ‘presbyter.’”

On pp. 94-8, we find these remarks :—

“Of the identity of the ‘bishop’ and ‘presbyter’ in the language of the apostolic age, the following evidence seems conclusive :—

“(1.) In the opening of this epistle [to the Philippians], St. Paul salutes the ‘bishops and deacons.’ Now, it is incredible that he should recognise only the first and third order, and pass over the second, though the second was absolutely essential to the existence of a Church, and formed the staple of its ministry. It seems, therefore, to follow of necessity, that the ‘bishops’ are identical with the ‘presbyters.’ . . .

“(2.) In the Acts (xx. 17), St. Paul is represented as summoning to Miletus the ‘elders’ or ‘presbyters’ of the Church of Ephesus. Yet, in addressing them immediately after, he appeals to them as ‘bishops’ or ‘overseers’ of the Church (xx. 28).

“(3.) Similarly, St. Peter, appealing to the ‘presbyters’ of the Churches

* For August, see pp. 146-7.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

addressed by him, in the same breath urges them to 'fulfil the office of bishops' with disinterested zeal (1 Pet. v. 1, 2).

"(4.) Again, in the First Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul, after describing the qualifications for the office of a 'bishop' (iii. 1-7), goes on at once to say what is required of 'deacons' (iii. 8-13). He makes no mention of presbyters. The term 'presbyter,' however, is not unknown to him; for, having occasion, in a later passage, to speak of Christian ministers, he calls these officers no longer 'bishops,' but 'presbyters' (v. 17-19).

"(5.) The same identification appears still more plainly from the apostle's directions to Titus (i. 5-7): 'That thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I appointed thee: if any one be *blameless*, the husband of one wife, having believing children, who are not charged with riotousness, or unruly: for a *bishop* must be *blameless*;' &c.

"(6.) Nor is it only in the apostolic writings that this identity is found. St. Clement of Rome wrote, probably, in the last decade of the first century, and in his language the terms are still convertible. Speaking of the apostles, he says, that, 'preaching in every country and city, they appointed their first-fruits, having tested them by the Spirit, to be *bishops* and *deacons* of them that should believe,' § 42. A little later, referring to the disorganised state of the Corinthian Church, he adds: 'Our apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife concerning the authority of the *bishopric*. . . . We shall incur no slight guilt if we eject those who have presented the offerings of the *bishopric* unblameably and holily. Blessed are the *presbyters* who have gone before, whose departure was crowned with fruit and perfection.'

"This is the last instance of identification. With the opening of the second century, a new phraseology begins. In the genuine epistles of Ignatius, the terms are used in their more modern sense." . . .

From Dr. Lightfoot's paper on the "Christian Ministry," appended to his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, we proceed to make some extracts. Speaking of apostolic times, he says (pp. 192-8):—

"The duties of the presbyters were twofold. They were both rulers and instructors of the congregation. This double function appears in St. Paul's expression 'pastors and teachers' (Eph. iv. 11), where, as the form of the original seems to show, the two words describe the same office under different aspects. Though *government* was probably the first conception of the office, yet the work of *teaching* must have fallen to the presbyters from the very first, and have assumed greater prominence as time went on. With the growth of the Church, the visits of the apostles and evangelists to any individual community must have become less and less frequent, so that the burden of instruction would be gradually transferred from these missionary preachers to the local officers of the congregation. Hence St. Paul, in two passages where he gives directions relating to bishops or presbyters, insists specially on the faculty of teaching as a qualification for the position (1 Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 9).

"It is clear, then, that at the close of the apostolic age, the two lower orders of the ministry [viz., the presbyterate and diaconate] were firmly and widely established; but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopate, properly so called, are few and indistinct.

"For, the opinion hazarded by Theodoret, and adopted by many later writers,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1870.]

that the same officers in the Church who were first called apostles came afterwards to be designated bishops, is baseless. If the two offices had been identical, the substitution of the one name for the other would have required some explanation. But, in fact, the functions of the apostle and the bishop differed widely. The apostle, like the prophet or the evangelist, held no *local* office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving about from place to place, founding and confirming new brotherhoods. The only ground on which Theodoret builds his theory is a false interpretation of a passage in St. Paul. At the opening of the epistle to Philippi, the presbyters (here called bishops) and deacons are saluted, while, in the body of the letter, one Epaphroditus is mentioned as an 'apostle' of the Philippians. If 'apostle' here had the meaning which is thus assigned to it, all the three orders of the ministry would be found at Philippi. But this interpretation will not stand. The true apostle, like St. Peter or St. John, bears this title as the messenger, the delegate, of Christ Himself; while Epaphroditus is only so styled as the messenger of the Philippian brotherhood, and, in the very next clause, the expression is explained by the statement that he carried their alms to St. Paul. The use of the word here has a parallel in another passage (2 Cor. viii. 23), where messengers (or apostles) of the Churches are mentioned. It is not, therefore, to the apostle that we must look for the prototype of the bishop.

"The history of the name [bishop] itself suggests a different account of the origin of the episcopate. If 'bishop' was at first used as a synonym for 'presbyter,' and afterwards came to designate the higher office under whom the presbyters served, the episcopate, properly so called, would seem to have been developed from the subordinate office. In other words, the episcopate was formed, not out of the apostolic order, by localisation, but out of the presbyteral, by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them."

There is scarcely any need for further quotation. Enough has been adduced to show that Bishop Lightfoot acknowledges the early Christian Church to have been without episcopal organisation. But he tries to prove that James, the Lord's brother, may be regarded as an example of a Christian bishop, in the later and more special sense of the term. While, however, it is urged that such an instance is found in the *Jewish* Christian Church, he grants that the New Testament presents no distinct traces of such organisation among the Gentile Christians. Yet, when we reach the second century, mention is made of bishops, in the later meaning of the word: episcopal government is already begun, and ever becoming more and more firmly established. To what must its origin be traced?

Dr. Lightfoot can find no firmer basis for the system than *expediency*; episcopacy, it is affirmed, arose out of the emergency in which the early Christian Churches were placed. For, when dissensions were caused by Jewish and Gentile converts, when false teachers, also, had begun to make their evil influence felt within the Christian Church, it seemed only proper that some one of the elders should be placed over the rest, having authority to deal with those who were producing schism and anarchy. Moreover, in these days of persecution, when Christ's flock

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1870.]

was still small, scattered, and feeble, it was highly advisable to have one presbyter placed over the Church, as a common leader and counsellor. Thus, it is stated, episcopacy gradually and naturally grew out of the pressing needs of the Church.

This is a very different position from that occupied by the High Church party, which claims a "Divine right" in favour of episcopacy. There is scarcely even the shadow of a claim to Scripture proof.

But let us also consider the acknowledgments of another esteemed Episcopal writer—Dean Alford, whose Greek Testament is so well known and so highly appreciated. On Acts xx. 17, where it is stated that Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the *elders* of the Church, he observes that "the elders are called, in verse 28, bishops or overseers. This circumstance began very early to contradict the growing views of the apostolic institution and necessity of prelatical episcopacy. Thus, Irenæus, III. xiv. 2, p. 201 'the *bishops and presbyters** were called together in Miletus, from Ephesus, and the other neighbouring cities.' Here we see (1) the two, bishops and presbyters, distinguished, as if *both* were sent for, in order that the titles might not seem to belong to the same persons, and (2) other neighbouring Churches also brought in, in order that there might not seem to be *ἐπίσκοποι* in one Church only. That neither of these was the case, is clearly shown by the plain words of this verse: he sent to *Ephesus*, and summoned the *elders of the Church*. So early did interested and disingenuous interpretations begin to cloud the light which Scripture might have thrown on ecclesiastical questions. The English version has hardly dealt fairly in this case with the sacred text, in rendering *ἐπισκόπους*, verse 28, '*overseers*'; whereas, it ought there, as in all other places, to have been *bishops*, that the fact of *elders and bishops having been originally and apostolically synonymous* might be apparent to the ordinary English reader, which now is not."

This is something more than a candid admission on the part of the Dean; it is more than we might expect, and perhaps as much as we could wish. He seems like a Presbyterian contending for parity among ministers, rather than a veritable Episcopal dignitary.

Again, when commenting on the expression, "bishops and deacons," in Phil. i. 1, he refers to his remarks, just quoted, on Acts xx. 17; and cites the following from Theodoret: "He [Paul] calls the elders [presbyters] '*bishops*' [or overseers], for they had *both* names at that period."

Commenting on 1 Timothy iii. 1, "If any man seeks the overseership (office of an overseer, or bishop)," he remarks, "it is merely laying a trap for misunderstanding, to render the word, at that time of the Church's history, 'the office of a bishop.' The '*bishops*' of the New Testament have, officially, nothing in common with our bishops. In my note on Acts xx. 17, I have stated that the English version ought

* The Italics, all through, are Alford's own.

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.)

to have been consistent with itself, and to have rendered ἐπισκόπους everywhere *bishops*, not *bishops* and *overseers* as suited ecclesiastical prejudices. But it would be better to adopt the other alternative, and always to render ἐπισκόπους *overseers*. Thus we should avoid any chance of identifying it with a present and different office, and take refuge in the meaning of the word itself, which, at the same time, bears an important testimony to the duties of the post. The identity of the bishop [or overseer] and presbyter [or elder] in apostolic times is evident from Titus i. 5-7." And when he comes to the last-mentioned passage, where Paul first speaks of "elders" (or presbyters), and then refers to these as "overseers," he remarks that these are "most plainly identified with the presbyter spoken of before."

Such acknowledgments as these, which all fair minds must make, are reassuring to a Presbyterian. Other testimonies of the like kind, from other Episcopalian writers, may be given in a future number.

J. K.

CALVIN'S HYMN TO CHRIST.

It would be more correct to say of this hymn that it is ascribed to Calvin than that it was certainly written by him. The first edition of the French metrical Psalter was published at Strassburg in 1539. The discovery of a solitary surviving copy in the library at Munich was made a few years ago by M. Douen, in the way described by Professor Mitchell in his interesting article, in the March number of this journal, on "Calvin and the Psalmody of the Reformed Churches." This primitive Psalter contained eighteen psalms, and three sacred songs, published with the music. Four of these psalm versions are certainly by Calvin (25, 38, 46, 91); and it is probable that he is also the author of the versions of Psalm 36, the Song of Simeon, and the Decalogue.

Several editions followed, a full account of which is given by M. Bovet in his very valuable work, "Histoire du Psautier des Eglises Réformées," Paris, 1872, pp. 247-52.

The hymn entitled "Salutation à Jesus Christ," a translation of which I give below, occurs only in the Strassburg edition of 1545 (so lovingly described by Bovet, p. 252), which opened with Calvin's celebrated preface: "Jehan Calvin à tous Chrestiens et amateurs de la parole de Dieu," John Calvin to all Christians and lovers of the Word of God. Dr. Schaff ascribes this hymn to Calvin without sign of doubt—adding, "It reveals a poetic vein, and a devotional fervour and tenderness, which one could hardly have suspected in the severe logician." "Christ in Song," Lond. 1870, p. 549. It may be observed, however, in passing—as Dr. Schaff would no doubt readily admit—that those who regard Calvin simply or chiefly as "a severe logician," know very little of the man, and of the qualities revealed especially in his letters. Compare the references in Cunningham, "Reformers and Theology of the Reformation," pp. 11 f., 313 f.

The English translation contributed to Dr. Schaff's collection by Mrs. H. B. Smith of New York, is careful and accurate; but, from following closely the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

metre of the original, it has, perhaps, a certain stiffness, which I have tried to avoid in the subjoined translation, by choosing an English metre of a simpler kind. The Rev. W. Fleming Stevenson gives five verses of Mrs. Smith's translation in his admirable little volume, "Hymns for the Church and Home," Lond. 1873, p. 149. There is also a German translation by Dr. Stähelin of Bâle, the biographer of Calvin. Reuss puts the hymn, along with nine psalms, the Song of Simeon, and the Ten Commandments in French verse, among Calvin's "Lesser Works" ("Corpus Reform.," vol. xxxiv. Brunsv. 1867), and says in his "*Prolegomena*," p. xxii, after going over the facts regarding them, so far as known: "We place, therefore, those psalms at the end of the service-book, as a genuine work of Calvin, of less importance, indeed, from a theological or poetical standpoint, but still unique of its kind, and noteworthy, if but on this account, that it is now for the first time brought out from its concealment. To these should be added that older poetical version of the Decalogue, which we have found to be altogether different from that of Marot. Bovet has made us doubtful of the Calvinian origin of the Song of Simeon. Much less do we venture to commend to our readers the other sacred songs, which we have noted above as different from those of Marot's collection, as being the works of Calvin; indeed, the learned author, to whom we have referred (Bovet), has propounded to us several considerations of much weight (*gravissimas*), by which he holds that it may be proved that these productions should be ascribed to some other than Calvin. "But since this question appears worthy of fuller discussion, and one which should be submitted to the judgment of other learned men also, who have, it may be, chosen, or may hereafter choose, to cultivate for themselves this department in the history of French literature, we have thought that we should do a thing not altogether useless by reserving a few pages for those songs, regarding which there is still some doubt."

The "*carmina illa dubia*" are the versions of Ps. xliii., cxiii., cxx., cxlii., and the "Salutation à Jesus Christ." Bovet (ed. 1872, p. 214) refers to the above statement by Reuss, and adds some other considerations to the "*gravissimas rationes*" formerly given. These, however, seem to apply to the psalm-versions only, and not to the hymn. Whatever may be the final decision as to the authorship of this "spiritual song," it must always be of interest and value from its intrinsic merits, and as a hymn, written, if not by Calvin himself, at least by some one in the circle of his friends and fellow-workers, and holding a place of honour in the Psalter with the formation of which he had so much to do.

I give the first verse of the original in the old French:—

Je Te salue, mon certain Redempteur,
Ma vraye fiancé et mon seul Salvateur,
Qui tant de labeur,
D'ennuys et de douleur,
As enduré pour moy;
Oste de nos cueurs
Toutes vaines langueurs
Fol soucy et esmoy.]

Translation.

I GREET Thee, my Redeemer sure,
I trust in none but Thee,

CALVIN'S HYMN TO CHRIST.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Thou who hast borne such toil and shame
 And suffering for me ;
 Our hearts from cares and cravings vain
 And foolish fears set free.

Thou art the King compassionate,
 Thou reignest everywhere,
 Almighty Lord, reign Thou in us,
 Rule all we have and are ;
 Enlighten us, and raise to heaven
 Amid Thy glories there.

Thou art the life by which we live ;
 Our stay and strength's in Thee ;
 Uphold us so in face of death,
 What time soe'er it be,
 That we may meet it with strong heart,
 And may die peacefully.

The true and perfect gentleness
 We find in Thee alone ;
 Make us to know Thy loveliness ;
 Teach us to love Thee known ;
 Grant us sweet fellowship with Thee,
 And all who are Thine own.

Our hope is in none else but Thee ;
 Faith holds Thy promise fast,
 Be pleased, Lord, to strengthen us,
 Whom Thou redeemed hast,
 To bear all troubles patiently,
 And overcome at last.

Children of Eve, and heirs of ill,
 To Thee Thy banished cry ;
 To Thee in sorrow's vale we bring
 Our sighs and misery ;
 We take the sinner's place, and plead :
 Lord, save us, or we die.

Look Thou, our Daysman and High Priest,
 Upon our low estate ;
 Make us to see God's face in peace
 Through Thee our advocate ;
 With Thee, our Saviour, may our feet
 Enter at heaven's gate.

Lord Jesus Christ, of holy souls
 The Bridegroom sweet and true,
 Meet Thou the rage of Antichrist,
 Break Thou his nets in two ;
 Grant us Thy Spirit's help, Thy will
 In very deed to do.

D. D. BANNERMAN.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

NOTES OF THE DAY.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE IN SCOTLAND.

THOUGH the Evangelical Alliance had its origin in Scotland, the "land of the mountain and the flood" has not proved its most congenial home. It would not be very difficult to give reasons for this; but this year there is an obvious explanation of the not very numerous meeting or telling proceedings at Edinburgh, in October, 1879. The meeting of the British organisation there followed too closely the general meeting of the whole Alliance at Basle. All who could spare a week or two for its meetings went to Basle, not only because it was likely to prove the larger gathering, but because a greater variety and deeper interest were likely to characterise its proceedings. Yet the Edinburgh meeting was by no means void of interest. One thing that made a considerable impression was the recital of the various services which the Evangelical Alliance had performed since its commencement in the cause of religious liberty and Christian progress. It has often been exposed to the reproach of being a mere talking society. It was shown that it has been abundant in labours, and in results of no mean importance. It has done excellent service in the cause of religious liberty; and even now, as we write, we cherish the hope that the deputation sent by the Basle meeting to the Emperor of Austria will effect a substantial improvement in the matter of religious toleration in the dominions of His Majesty.

The Evangelical Alliance differs from the Presbyterian in being an alliance of individuals, while the other is an alliance of Churches. Yet there need be no antagonism, but may be the most friendly feeling between the two. Necessarily, the Presbyterian Alliance has a smaller area to work upon, but within that area, there are closer bonds of fellowship. Both carry out the great doctrine of the Creed,—“the communion of the saints;” but the Evangelical Alliance recognises their communion only as individuals, the other has a more direct eye to their communion as parts of “the Holy Catholic Church.” It is a great and good work the Evangelical Alliance accomplishes, in gathering the children of God together, “one by one;” but it is a step higher to try to gather them Church by Church. We think it may be said of each of them that they are doing what they can. The Evangelical Alliance does not attempt more than a union of individuals; the Presbyterian Alliance does not attempt more than a voluntary and non-authoritative alliance of Churches. Both are comparatively incomplete; but each does what it can, and though perfect union may be far off, we are not to despise the day of small things.

DR. JESSUP OF BEYROUT.

One good thing which the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance at Edinburgh did was to bring Dr. Jessup, Missionary of the American Presbyterian Church at Beyrout, and Moderator of the last General Assembly, into the circle of the Alliance. Dr. Jessup made a deep impression on every one who heard him. All were interested in the man, and all were interested in his work. Dr. Jessup would have been an able and a powerful man anywhere, but as a missionary he seems to have developed wonderfully. He appears to belong to that remarkable band whom foreign service makes far greater than the quiet routine of home work would have made. He is of the order of missionary statesmen, with a comprehensive survey and a firm grasp—looking round in every direction, and forming a clear and strong opinion of what needs to be done. If the question be asked, How are great men made? the answer is, they have superior gifts to begin with, but to a much larger extent they are made by their work, position, and surroundings. Missionaries in certain positions require to act so much for themselves, they are surrounded by so many difficulties, and can receive so little real help in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

the way of advice from those at home, that they are thrown on their own resources and on their Master, to a degree wonderfully fitted to draw them out, and make them great. It is strange that so many young men of spirit can be content to spend their lives in a little pastorate, with such splendid spheres of usefulness inviting them in the wide, wide world.

The power of Dr. Jessup was shown most in the fresh interest which he kindled in the social and religious condition of the East. His pictures of Eastern life were vivid to a degree, yet drawn without apparent effort. The way in which the subjects of the Porte were shown to be fleeced and spoiled by the paternal Government in which they rejoice, made hearers at a loss whether most to admire their patience, or wonder how it was possible for them to live. An account of how taxes are payed placed the scene before our very eyes. We saw a village with the grain all gathered, sending word to the tax-gatherer to come and carry off his tithe, as the people, though starving, dared not touch the remainder until his claims were satisfied. We heard the lordly answer that he could not come—could not come for a month. We saw the poor agriculturists going to him, falling down and kissing his feet, and promising that if he came at once, they would give him a fourth. No, no, he cannot come; he has so much to do that they must wait his leisure. We heard the deputation enlarging their offer, until at last an arrangement was come to, the effect of which was that, instead of a tenth, at least a half of the whole produce went to the tax-gatherer. After this, we felt that to grumble at the payment of our taxes in this country was something utterly unreasonable. Equally vivid were Dr. Jessup's pictures of the way in which justice is dispensed, or rather, as he said, dispensed with, in the law-courts. The "almighty dollar" is clearly the Chief Justice there. Nothing could have been more clear than the absurdity of expecting reform of a system so utterly corrupt. The whole Crimean war has left Turkey as it was. Dr. Jessup saw no way of reforming the judicial system except by the appointment of British judges. The people have a high idea of the fairness of the English, and would feel it a great boon to have justice administered by them. We have been accustomed to think that if the Turk could be driven out of Europe, he might be tolerated a little longer in Asia. On the contrary, it would seem that in Asia he is as great a curse as in Europe. But Dr. Jessup's object was not to frame a new constitution for Turkey. It was to excite a deeper interest in the work of missions. It was to encourage the Turkish Missions Aid Society, which is the chief channel for friends in Great Britain to aid the American and other missions in Syria. There is so much ignorance on the subject that visits like Dr. Jessup's are both greatly needed and of much use. We shall be delighted if Dr. Jessup or any of his brethren will enable us, through *The Catholic Presbyterian*, to make known from time to time the state of the country and the progress of the cause.

MISSIONARY PRESBYTERIES.

On one point of Church organisation Dr. Jessup expressed a decided opinion. He is not in favour of the missionaries abroad being formed into presbyteries. He thinks they should continue to act as missionaries, encouraging the training of native agents, and the formation of native presbyteries. When foreign missionaries sit side by side with natives in presbyteries, the latter are liable to be smothered. He thinks they would be better to sit alone. They can get advice from the missionaries when needed; but if a vigorous, self-reliant court is to be formed, the natives must be encouraged to depend on themselves. This is a point of great importance. In so far as the opposite policy has been followed, it may turn out that we have been penny wise and pound foolish. Here is precisely one of the points which the Presbyterian Alliance and *The Catholic Presbyterian* may help to ventilate. We leave the matter meanwhile in the hands of Professor Kellogg, of Allegheny, whose article in the November number we highly value, and hope to see followed up ere long. Dr. Jessup bore the highest testimony to

CONSECRATION OF THE EDINBURGH CATHEDRAL. 463

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Dr. Kellogg's work as a missionary, and made us glad to think that the difficult problems of mission work have got such men to grapple with them.

CONSECRATION OF THE EDINBURGH CATHEDRAL.

This event was the occasion of the gathering together of a multitude of Episcopal dignitaries and clergy, the like of which Scotland probably never saw. On the whole, it passed off pleasantly. The tone of the services was moderate and in-offensive. Things were said of the Presbyterians as pleasant as the case admitted of, and no occasion has been given for any complaint that the response of the Presbyterians has been out of keeping. We believe it has been the prayer of many that the building consecrated to God might be accepted by God, and used by Him for the advancement of the Gospel of Christ. If any arrangement could tend to fulfil that prayer, it is the place which Dean Montgomery is to hold in the cathedral; for no better man or more earnest servant of the Lord is to be found in any of our Churches, or one any more disposed to pursue his own line of work without hurting the feelings or interfering with the usefulness of others.

It would really be a great comfort to Catholic-minded Presbyterians in Scotland, if they could find a way of welcoming among them a devout Episcopal clergy who might act as shepherds to that portion of the community by whom their ministrations are welcomed, and develop a type of Christianity not very common in Presbyterian churches. If, for example, we could have in Scotland an institution that would give us a body of devout Christian laymen such as the Church of England often furnishes—of high culture and courtesy, warm and loving, thinking little of the glory of their Church, but much of the glory of Christ and the good of men, and recognising with brotherly cordiality all of every name who are labouring in the same service and spirit—that would be a blessing indeed. Or if the Episcopal Church should teach us all those lessons we need so much, of hushed reverence and self-restraint in the service of God, should teach us to get rid of many rough and coarse ways in God's house, and to demean ourselves there as in the very presence of Him before whom the seraphim veil themselves—that too would be a most useful lesson. Or if it should provide a service that would be suitable for a class of devout minds who specially desire what is earthly in them to be subdued in Divine service, who desire that before God their soul may become as a weaned child, and to whom a calm, restful tone is more welcome and more useful than one of impulse and stimulation, on that ground too we should welcome it. We should welcome it, even though doubting whether its method affords a very wholesome way of attaining that frame of mind; believing, as we do, that the rest which comes from faith is far better than the rest inspired by tender music; in fact, that the only rest worthy of the name is that which springs from faith's view of Christ, and a full reception of all the truths that cluster round His finished work and His living interest in His people. We might hope that faithful preaching would direct the view to Him, and prevent the delusion that the temporary magnetic effect of music, architecture, solemn words and sacred tones is equivalent to a transformation of the soul.

But there is one fatal obstacle to this pleasing dream. It is the isolated attitude of the Episcopal clergy, and their utterly unwarranted refusal to recognise the orders of their Presbyterian brethren. The time was, when English bishops acted on a different principle. But now, uniformly, when a Presbyterian minister joins the Episcopal Church, he is ordained *de novo*. What does this imply? That in the view of the bishop, he was not a true minister of Christ before. That whenever he administered the sacraments, he laid unhallowed hands on holy things. That when he assumed to be a minister of Christ, he made a false and unwarranted claim. We should be glad of any outlet from the difficulty, but we see none. All Presbyterian clergymen are unauthorised usurpers. The holiest of them are as much so as the most secular and careless. True, this is an odious position. Many Episcopalians that have not the courage of their principles, shrink from it. But it is the clear, necessary out-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

come of the system. How can the Presbyterian clergy welcome those who would unchurch them? How can their people think lightly of a system that proclaims the ministers under whom they have been led to Christ and nourished up in the Christian life, to be usurpers? Either the Scotch Episcopalian clergy believe this, or they do not. If they do believe it, the case is plain; if they do not believe it, they accept in word what they repudiate in act. In either case, their attitude is most unsatisfactory.

Meanwhile, Presbyterians must try to perfect that instrument of preaching in which their great strength lies; and at the same time, give fresh heed to the various parts of worship, and remove all ground for complaint on the part of those who say that their worship is uncouth or irreverent, and that their services have nothing in them to soothe and calm the soul.

THE FUNCTION OF EVANGELISTS.

The precise scriptural position of the evangelist is a question that has recently been occupying a good deal of attention on the part of Presbyterians on both sides of the Atlantic. It is undoubted that there were evangelists in the early Church. But were they a separate order, distinct from apostles on the one side, and from elders and deacons on the other? We have very little information about them in Scripture. Timothy did the work of an evangelist, and Philip, one of the seven deacons, is styled an evangelist. We have been interested in a report on the subject to the Synod of New York by a committee, of which Dr. Hitchcock was convener. The position there taken up seems to us the true one—that the term evangelist denoted a *function*, not an *office*. That is to say, that evangelising was one of the functions of an elder, and that the evangelist, *par excellence*, was set aside to exercise this function. The office of an elder is a comprehensive one, and few elders are equally qualified to exercise them all. It is only certain elders that are qualified to preach; therefore some are set apart especially for this work. These get the name of pastors and teachers. Some elders may be specially qualified to evangelise, and may be set apart for work of evangelisation; these may be called evangelists. This is what is meant by the “evangelist” being a separate function, but not a separate office. The evangelist recognised by the Church is an ordained man, ordained as an elder, and commonly a preaching elder, but specially charged with evangelisation. A missionary to a heathen country thus corresponds to an evangelist.

Unordained men who are employed to hold meetings and promote mission work must be regarded as just fulfilling the obligation which rests on every Christian to do what he can to acquaint others with the truth. It is certainly not desirable that any men should be professional evangelists without recognition from the Church to which they belong.

The subject is one of some difficulty, and though we have expressed our agreement with Dr. Hitchcock's view, we are open to consider the views of others. The report recommends that no new order of evangelists be appointed, the evangelistic function being already provided for under sanctions and safeguards which ought at once to ensure efficiency and protect from crude, extravagant, and heretical ministrations.

THE WORKING CLASSES AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Some disappointment has been felt at the tenor of the papers in several preceding numbers of this journal on the Problem of the Labouring Classes. It is not the line of discussion which is deemed most useful in a Christian journal. We are told that we go away from the special function of the Christian Church in discussing these social questions, instead of grappling with the great problem—how to bring the masses directly under the influence of the Gospel. The objection seems to us a frivolous one. Some good people think that no good is done unless we are always working at the very heart and centre of things. They might as well say that no good can be done by a missionary during the years he spends in learning the language of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

the people he is to labour among. The real state of the case is, that the working classes—at least many of them—are disaffected towards the institutions of the country, the Christian Church included. This fact must be taken into account in dealing with them, and an attitude and tone corresponding to it must be assumed by those who would reach their hearts and do them good. We believe that a certain want of sympathy on the part of the Churches, in reference to the aims and aspirations of working people, is a hindrance in the way of securing their confidence and conciliating their friendship. On the other hand, when any special interest is shown towards them—even a meeting called by a Church conference—we see what crowds assemble. The working classes form a good soil for the Christian Church to work in; but the work must be done in the spirit of brotherly sympathy, without patronage or condescension, or the wounding of their sense of independence.

THE LATE DRS. WILLIS AND TOPP.

Two of the most honoured fathers of the Canadian Church have recently been taken from us—both having been present at the General Council held at Edinburgh—Dr. Willis, who long presided over the Theological College at Toronto; and Dr. Topp, who, for a still longer period, was the minister of one of the most important congregations of that town. Dr. Willis had, some years ago, retired from office; but Dr. Topp was still in active service when disease of the heart suddenly cut short his career. Both were men of the highest character, although of very different types. The one was a scholar and theologian, ready for war and conflict, and eager to stand out conspicuous in the field of battle; the other was quiet, retiring, a faithful and laborious pastor, a loved and loving friend. Yet each had his place, and filled it well. It is painful to think how many bright lights have been extinguished during the brief interval since the Edinburgh meeting. But they have gone to enrich the Church above, leaving for us a good example and a fragrant memory, stirring us up to equal their service, and holding out to us the prospect of one day sharing their reward.

GENERAL SURVEY.

SWITZERLAND.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE BASLE CONFERENCE.

By Rev. J. E. CARLYLE.

WITH regard to the state of religion in the various countries, the President, Herr Sarasin, took a somewhat gloomy view of the present state and prospects of European society. I may say that this generally characterised the addresses of the foreign speakers. Herr Sarasin pointed to the increase of crime and of prisoners in Germany; to the suicides in Switzerland, now amounting to 1 in 4450 of the population; to the satanic words in which sceptical science addressed its votaries—"Yea! hath God said, Ye shall not surely eat of it? Ye shall not die." And, then, while the world deified man thus, Rome deified the Church, putting it in the place of God. All this suggested a future neither joyous nor peaceful, but rather a deeper and wider conflict; and there might be expected even persecution and shame. The Alliance had to give a testimony not soon to die away, but one in which it must persevere, while its words must be followed by deeds of love. He reminded his English friends of the words of the poet—"Look not to the ground, ye favourites of a king. Are we not high? High be our thoughts." And so let the work, the testimony, the co-operation be done with glad and firm courage, with the same joy with which the Apostle Paul, with shackled hands, appealed to the Church in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

Philippi—"Rejoice ye in the Lord alway : and again I say, Rejoice." The views of the foreign brethren may, to use a current phrase, be described as somewhat pessimist. Nor is it any wonder, when we look at Scepticism, Socialism, Nihilism, assassination on the Continent. The Anglo-Saxon Christian view seems somewhat brighter, both as to society and its institutions, and as to science. As regards the latter, science and higher invention, in our day, it is owned, have had their greatest impulses from Anglo-Saxon discovery ; yet we are not so afraid of the results. We distinguish true science from the mere hypotheses which popular scepticism seeks to base on it. We feel that science in itself, as true, must be ennobling to the mind, and our theologians of all parties give to it thus a more friendly recognition.

In Dr. Schaff's report on the religious state of America, some of the leading points were the following. One feature of American Christianity was its breadth. All Churches of the old world were represented except the Greek. In America there were no sects, dissenters, nonconformists—only denominations. Denominations were not sects ; in point of fact, they were nothing else than European Confessions and Churches ; only, while these are territorially separated in the old Continent, they stand in close proximity in America. The various Churches are historical individualities. Another feature of America is the entire separation of Church and State. The State has a more limited range than in Europe. The Church only asks for protection. This position does not, however, arise from any undervaluing of religion, but from the respect the State cherishes for the rights of conscience. In point of fact, the Americans are as much Christians and Churchmen as any nation with a State Church. Christianity stands in America under the domain of the common right. This is illustrated, as regards marriage, by the decision of the Supreme Law Courts, that monogamy alone is lawful. It is seen, again, in the laws regarding the Sabbath. In no country is it so well kept, except in Scotland. Its legislation for it was protective, not coercive. In the school, also, the first lesson was generally the Bible. It was true, as regards this, difficulties were raised by Rome in the great cities. The question, indeed, was not settled yet, and would lead to a severe conflict. In the American Churches, scepticism was not within but outside of them. The oldest of the Churches were the Dutch and Episcopal ; the most influential, the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians ; the largest and the most prompt to act, the Methodists. The Romish Church had made great progress in the United States as regards numbers, in 1800 the proportion being as 1 to 100, now as 1 to 7. They maintain that they are now 7 millions in number. But the immigration, it is to be noticed, has been very great,—47 per cent. of the immigrants of the last twenty years were Irish or German Roman Catholics. In fact, the growth of Rome has not been in proportion to the immigration. Protestantism and Freedom have made greater progress than she has done.*

I would now notice more specially the English-speaking section of the Evangelical Alliance at Basle. One of the subjects which attracted most attention was the Sunday school. So deep, indeed, was the interest, that there was an adjournment from the earlier meeting of the day till the evening. Dr. Hall, one of the vice-presidents, was appropriately called to the chair. His interest and services are well known in regard to the system of international lessons. The Rev. Dr. Anderson, of New York, read a paper on the subject. The place for the Sunday school was, he held, within the Church. It had no independent position. Its human organisation must link itself on to the Divine. The Church, through its personal contact by the Sunday school, influences the young. She says, like her Lord, "Suffer little children to come unto Me." It aids, also, the intellectual training of the young, adapting itself to the mental child-life, which is quite different from that of the man. In carrying out this, it has originated a valuable class of literature for the young, alike graphic, fresh, and instructive, and always growing in merit.

* Mr. Parnell, M.P., in a recent appeal to the Irish race, affirms that there are 10 millions of Irish in the United States. If this be true, it thoroughly confirms Dr. Schaff's statement.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1870.]

The Sunday school has other benefits. It interests the young in those ordinances of religion which are to be, not only a duty, but a refreshment and a joy. Reflexly, it has aided in keeping alive in the Church a love of souls, and it has promoted largely a spirit of Christian union. Its international lessons are a bond of the Churches.

The Rev. Dr. Dykes, who took the place of Sir Charles Reed, regarded the battle of to-day as having for its focus the school. There were two forces in contest—the spirit of authority, based on tradition, and the spirit of denial, turning into license the liberty of free-thought. Truth and right lay in the middle, in a faith that is not priest-ridden, nor fed on traditional falsehood. A free education lies exposed and open to the wind of inquiry, while yet the needs of the spiritual man and of the Christian faith are not ignored. The resources to supply this better education are the Sunday school and the Christian home. Both are needed. The Sunday school is a poor influence if neutralised by domestic influence. The home, again, while leaving on the soul a holy influence, may lack the technical skill to inform the understanding with orderly truth. The Church has not yet taken the school sufficiently under its control. The best intelligence of the Church is needed, not so much to extend Sunday schools, as to make the best of them. The characteristics of the Sunday school, as of all good teaching, are, that it should be orderly, systematic, and thorough. Order there must be. Text books are indispensable. The outlines of saving knowledge should be gone over in a definite time. There must be, also, examination—no plan could be effective without occasional and careful questioning. The training of teachers was also an urgent want. The church and the Sunday school ought to be brought into closer contact. There is a missing link somewhere. Might it not be found in the Children's Church? From child-worship to adult-worship would be but a step. Dr. Hall referred to the facilities for careful examination afforded by the international system of lessons. The pastors who availed themselves of it learned much of the Sunday school. Such a bridge as Dr. Dykes suggested might be found in the pastor directing a part of his Sunday service to the children. A number of addresses were given on Continental Sunday schools. In Germany, they had their origin in Frankfort in 1863. Now there were 2000 schools and 10,000 teachers! In Switzerland, there were 462 schools with 40,000 children; in France there were upwards of 1000 Sunday schools—in Paris alone there were 500, with 8000 scholars. Count Bernstorff, referring to Germany, stated that Sunday schools there were more for edification, as, in the day schools, religion formed a considerable part of the daily instruction. In Saxony, a special liturgy had been drawn up for children. The Sunday school was now recognised by the Government as a part of the inner mission work. I may be permitted to add here that, as regards Germany, the teaching of the young, apart from Sunday schools, has never been neglected. The afternoon service in most churches is catechetical, and designed for the young. The teaching of the catechumens has, as Baron von Bunsen has somewhere shown, been a work which has probably, more than anything else, kept alive religion in Germany. Still, the Sunday school has been of great value. It has much reflex benefit in training the lay members of the Church to direct interest in Christian work. Germany still, however, retains its Children's Divine Service, the missing link to which Dr. Dykes refers.

The Mission addresses of the Conference deserve a fuller notice than I can afford them. There were, first, Jewish Missions. The prominence given to these at the Basle Meeting, and (as I notice since) at the Church Conference at Swansea, indicates that this vital cause of Christianity excites an ever-deepening interest. The most interesting paper of Herr de le Roi, of Breslau, was well fitted to stimulate this. He showed the Israel of our age is still under the blow of that dispersion which scattered them eighteen centuries ago, but agitated by tendencies and aspirations towards reunion. They are in number about five millions, of whom six-sevenths inhabit Christian lands. The largest proportion in Europe live in Slav countries, the smallest among the Latin race,—the Germanic races

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

holding the middle place. There are in Germany 1,150,000 Jews. There are two features which mark the Jews of to-day—the abandonment of their old beliefs, and the awakening of a sentiment of nationality. The emancipation of the Jews generally has led to their greater mixture in society, and removed them from the old moral and religious ideal. The Talmud is more and more abandoned. There is a growing indifference for religion; circumcision itself is falling into desuetude; there are more mixed marriages and more divorces. In Prussia alone, there have been 732 such marriages in three years. Along with these changes, it is remarkable that the national feeling has deepened. They aspire even to be missionaries to the world. Not that they seek for proselytes, but they hope to exercise an influence, indirect, yet ever more powerful on Christianity. I may say in passing that this remarkably harmonises with Professor Gode't's view of the Jewish future. The Jewish nation is the suffering Messiah of the world, which has long rejected it, but will accept at last its law. Then Israel will be at the head of humanity. Armed with this interpretation of the prophecies, the reformed Jews are with all the Christian elements in modern society. They are as a leaven, leavening German society. There are 220 missionaries to the Jews. More Jews have been converted to Christianity in this than in any previous age. Conversions are reckoned at 100,000 since 1800, and now increase at a rate of more than 1000 a-year.

M. de le Roi's interesting address, which time prevented him from finishing, was followed by that of Professor Christlieb, of Bonn. He too, although allowed an hour, was unable to present in that time the full outline of the great subject prescribed to him on Missions generally. He began by an eloquent sketch of the extent now embraced in missions. There were 70 missionary societies—27 in Great Britain, 18 in America, 9 in Germany (including Basle). There were some 2500 European preachers, 23,000 native catechists. The converts were now some 1,650,000. In 1878, more than 60,000 pagans passed over to Christianity. There were coasts and archipelagos which had become entirely Christian. The money raised by missionary societies amounted to some million and a-quarter sterling, of which one-half was contributed in Great Britain. There were 400,000 scholars in the mission schools. The Bible had been translated into 226 different languages, and the copies circulated amounted to 148 millions. More than 70 barbarous languages had been endowed with a grammar and a literature. But there were shadings to this picture. What were a million and a-half of conversions to the ocean of paganism? There were enemies in the field. European commerce often exercised an adverse influence; there was the hatred of race; there was modern scepticism. The cultivated heathen classes often opposed to the missionary the reasonings of Hegel, and Strauss, and Renan.

There were many other evangelistic addresses of great value. I limit myself to Pastor Fliedner's. Mr. Fliedner is well known for his evangelistic work in Madrid. He noticed the work in Spain, but also extending to Portugal and to South America. In all these countries there is a struggle with gross superstition on the one hand, and frivolous scepticism on the other. Spain has proclaimed religious tolerance, but this is surrounded by numerous restrictions. The evangelists are of three classes—former Seminarists or priests, some of whom are valuable, while regarding others there must be mistrust; there are also native laymen, by whom Pastor Fliedner has been greatly aided in his work; then there are the young Spaniards who have been educated theologically in Switzerland. There is need in Spain, also, of a theological seminary. Four foreign societies aid in circulating Bibles and tracts in Spain. There are now sixty missionary stations, and from 10,000 to 20,000 attend the religious services. There are fifty Sunday schools, with some 3000 pupils, an orphan house, and sixty day schools with some 6000 or 7000 scholars. The converted not only hear with readiness the Word, but they contribute to the cause. They sing in their own language the hymns of Luther and of Sankey.

Passing from missions to general papers, I can only notice two. That of Pro-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

fessor Wach on Christianity and Modern Society was of a very high character. Science, he observed, cannot conquer religion. It shows greater modesty of late. It is more ready to recognise what it does not know. Religion has, in fact, not been injured by what science really knows, but by what she has no means of knowing, and what she has yet recklessly flung to the masses. Science cannot solve the social questions of the age. Materialism is going back. The State also cannot solve these higher questions. We Germans place a high value on the State, but it cannot create, it can only favour the free development of this moral life of society. It is only life in the Church which can accomplish it. It is only faith working by love that can bring back modern society to God. It is not preaching that can do it. It is such a spirit as that displayed in the missions, and a new life in Christian theology. The age really witnesses religious progress. Dull rationalism is at an end. The beautiful system of humanitarianism leads only to injury if the religious element be wanting. In connection with this higher question of society, the subject of the workman of our modern industry was treated with great ability, and in a fine Christian tone, by M. Steinthal, a manufacturer of Alsace. His paper will be found, when published, of very high value indeed. He was followed by Herr Carl Sarasin, who is, I believe, a manufacturer of ribbons at St. Alban, in a speech full of sound sense and warm Christian sympathy for the class of workmen.

The only other papers I can glance at related to Christian education. I pass by the papers of the referents, or appointed speakers, as they seemed to me scarcely up to the mark. The subject, however, gave rise to an interesting discussion, conducted in a good tone, as to the place of the Christian School in the modern State. M. Pressensé made an eloquent speech in favour of the School being regarded as lay. In the present age, there is not only a Church—there are Churches. One cannot hand over to one the care of all. We have now, properly speaking, no State Church, only denominations. Dr. Baur of Berlin and Count Bismarck Bohlen held the opposite view of a Christian State and a Christian School. But, in fact, the two parties pointed to different things. The German speakers pointed to German historical Christianity, which still holds its ground, and the position of which they would not willingly surrender. M. Pressensé, on the other hand, referred specially to a divided society, and to Protestantism as it is in France. The discussion was conducted in a Christian and brotherly tone. Anglo-Saxon Christianity would probably incline most to M. Pressensé's view, and would scarcely entertain the fears of German Christians as to the future.

I must omit much I should willingly have noticed. The pulpit, I may say, was very well represented at the Congress, by such men as Dr. Stoughton, Dr. Cremer, Dr. Fraser, and others. Dr. Fraser's sermon was highly appreciated, as opportune, eloquent, and fervid. A few words of Mr. Arthur, spoken in what he would probably call stammering German, was yet so pervaded by the finest Christian feeling, as deeply to move all his hearers. Professor Riggenbach, whose services were invaluable both at the Conference and in all the business arrangements connected with it, worthily brought the Alliance Conference to a close.

GREECE.

PROTESTANT SCHOOLS.

By Rev. T. R. SAMPSON, American Missionary, Athens.

THE history of Protestant schools in Greece is sadly monotonous. Soon after the establishment of Greek independence, the State, at the instigation of the Church, took up a position from which it has never receded. Proselytism was forbidden by the constitution, and special legislation carried out the spirit of the constitution, by requiring that, in all schools opened for the general public, the catechism of the Greek Church should be taught by a priest of that Church, and that the picture of "the Holy Mother of God" should be hung in the lecture-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

room. Where there was objection to these requirements, the law was inexorably enforced. If, however, even one of the first two was accepted, this was taken as a virtual surrender of principle, and the other two were not necessarily insisted upon. That this is a correct statement of the law and practice the following extracts will conclusively show. The late lamented Rev. George W. Leyburn wrote in reference to his school, closed more than thirty-five years ago—"As to the subject of your inquiry, I can only say that our schools at Areopolis were obliged to be surrendered to the Government because of our not being willing to introduce Darbaris' Catechism, and that the Episcopal Mission Schools at Athens did continue in existence, the catechism being used in them. As to the reason in regard to the latter, you can judge as well as I. I simply state the facts." Mr. Leyburn was a missionary of the American Board, and had a school of more than 200 children. He left Greece soon after the closing of the school. The second school mentioned above continues in existence still, and is the only school in Greece under the charge of Protestants.

A school was opened by the Baptists in 1867. The gentleman in charge of the school writes:—"In 1874 the Minister of Education visited the school, and observing that the Gospel was taught among other lessons, he invited us to the Educational Department to inquire about the school. We told him it was a school for free education to poor children, sustained by an American society. We asked them for a regular permission from the Government to continue the school for which we had been called in question, which he promised to give on condition that we should not teach the Gospel in it. This we could not promise, but we urged that a permission should be given us, in favour of which he promised to use his influence, but to our surprise, instead of fulfilling his promise, he sent a police-officer who turned the teachers (three in number) and the children (one hundred and thirty) into the street, locked the doors, and sent us the keys. Subsequently, upon our entreaties for the reopening of the school, he sent us word that we could have the permission if fifty names of the parents of the children could be obtained who were willing to trust them to our care, and in a short time fifty-four names were handed in to him; but the permission was still refused. Even the entreaties of the poor mothers to him were unavailing."

The petition has been renewed several times. The last and final answer contained the three conditions mentioned above. The same gentleman concludes: "As these conditions are not in accordance with our principles, we cannot comply with them; and there the matter stands."

The only other case to which attention need be called is that of the school sustained for several years at Athens by the Woman's Missionary Society of New York. This school was closed two years ago. It was a girls' school, with 120 or more scholars. The paper closing it has become remarkable. It contained the same conditions, and concludes by warning the ladies in charge that, if the promoters of the school are "prevented from complying with these requirements of the law, but desire to proceed in establishing a private school of any known religious denomination, let them know that we have no difficulty in granting them permission for this object, provided only the children of Protestants attend upon said school, which, however, will continue under the immediate supervision of the authorities. In this case they ought to know what a responsibility they assume, if it be discovered that even *one* scholar of the orthodox faith has been received by them."

Incorrect statements with regard to this subject had been made by the British ambassador resident at Athens from false information given to him. The above document was sent to him, and forwarded by him to the Marquis of Salisbury. His Lordship addressed to the representatives of Her Majesty's Government, at all the courts of Europe, a long letter, in which he gave it as his opinion that such requirements were a contravention of the liberty secured by the Treaty of Berlin to all the inhabitants of Turkey, and of those provinces about to be transferred from the rule of the Sultan to that of some other potentate. "In our judgment, it follows

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

as a necessary consequence, that any cession of territory that is made must be subject to the condition that the Greek Government shall bestow upon its new subjects, in the ceded territory, the same liberty in respect to the exterior practice of religion that is conferred upon them by the laws of the Ottoman Empire. The law prohibiting the admission of a child belonging to the orthodox church into any school which does not belong to it, is clearly in contravention of this liberty." This paper received a favourable reply from France, Italy, and Germany. Austria and Russia did not think so favourably of the interpretation given to the 62nd article of the Treaty of Berlin. These countries are notoriously intolerant, and it might not be safe to commit themselves to this view. It might "cut too deep;" for it does not take a great deal of insight, much less what diplomatists are usually endowed with, to see that the rule which applies to Thessaly and Epirus could not be inapplicable to those "lion's shares" of "the Sick Man" which came into the claws of the Eagle and the Bear.

If this interpretation can be sustained, it seems full of promise. It will be the insertion of the wedge. Every true son of Greece would rejoice to see her stand forth, "clothed and in her right mind," relieved of the shackles which have so long bound her; for it is only by securing to all of her citizens the full enjoyment of their most sacred and inalienable rights that she can secure the confidence of the nations, or gain and maintain that sympathy with them upon which her immediate prosperity and progress so much depend.

She may now justly cry for "deliverance from the body of this death," so long as her growth and life-blood are checked by the fatal coils of a dead and stiffening monster—a Church which has known no reformation, but is given over, bound hand and foot, to tradition; in which "obedience has been petrified into formalism, religion degraded into ritual, and morality cankered by casuistry."

VICTORIA.

Letter from Rev. A. J. CAMPBELL, Geelong.

THE modesty that has kept so many of the brethren here from sending contributions to *The Catholic Presbyterian* is not unbecoming, but will wear away by-and-by, though for a time their courage seems to have failed them when they saw the high-class character of the publication. Meanwhile, the duty of sending you a letter has devolved on me. I shall very gladly do what I can.

1. *The Catholic Presbyterian* is growing in favour here. The brevity and variety of its articles have a charm for non-theological readers; while its solid appearance indicates that it wishes to be ranked above the ephemeral literature of the day. I think that it is particularly well fitted to engage the attention of that class of our office-bearers (the eldership) in whom we require a knowledge of confessional theology equal to that of our ministers, but whom we have taken little pains to attract to the study of our standards.

2. In view of the next meeting of the Council, I have been endeavouring to fulfil the duties that were entrusted to me in connection with the four committees. Three months ago, I forwarded to Dr. Lorimer a statement in regard to the creeds and formulas of the Australasian Churches; and am now collecting information in regard to their missionary operations. The queries from the Statistical Committee have not reached me yet; but there will not be much difficulty in dealing with them when they come. Our last Assembly appointed an Historical Committee, which will provide materials for the Council's Committee on the Desiderata of Presbyterian History. The first fruits of its labours will be forthcoming about the end of this year.

3. I am not sure that our Australasian Churches will send as many delegates to Philadelphia as they did to Edinburgh. It is a costly business, as they very handsomely pay the way of their clerical delegates. But you may count, I think, upon three clerical, and two or three lay representatives. I would have relished

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

exceedingly another sight of the venerable fathers and brethren whom I met in 1877. But I must postpone that pleasure till the Council crosses the line, and meets in Melbourne.

4. You have asked for hints in regard to the arrangements of the next Council. I shall venture to make one suggestion. It is exceedingly desirable that the meetings of the Council should run over a longer time; not merely in order that a larger amount of business may be despatched, but in order that opportunities may be given to its members of getting something better and deeper than a superficial acquaintance with each other. We know what store Paul set upon the Christian friendships which he formed in his travels, and what a number of precious memories he carried about in his heart. The communion of saints is a doctrine of our creed, but it is a poetical rather than a practical one. There were a number of men at our Edinburgh Council whom one would have been delighted to know, if time and opportunity had been given for coming into personal contact with them. I shall never forget a two hours' walk and talk with Dr. Willis and Dr. Fisch, after the pleasant gathering at Merton House. Dr. Fisch asked me many questions about Australia; so many that I asked him if he had any friends there. He said, No. But he felt a deep interest in that young country, and hoped that it would fight on Christ's side, and then he whispered into my ear, "And I pray for Australia every day." Better words no man could have spoken to me. And yet it is wonderful! with the burden of France upon his heart, this distant dim region of the earth had found a place for itself there. Surely the true Christian is the true Catholic. But now (for my suggestion) might not the morning hours, say till twelve o'clock, be devoted to Christian fellowship? First round the breakfast table, then at the Throne of Grace, and next in conversation, locomotion, and mutual introduction, intermingled with brief addresses, of a warm, homely, personal kind, the brethren telling each other where they have been, and what they have been doing, seeing, and thinking since last Council. If it were my privilege to be at one of these meetings, I would pour out my thanks to the principals and professors of the fifteen different Theological Seminaries in Great Britain, Ireland, and America, which by God's blessing I was enabled to visit in 1877—addressing 1000 students, and lodging in their hearts some definite notion of, and (I hope) some liking for this fair bit of God's world; I would tell the people of Philadelphia that I had wandered through their beautiful city one Saturday in search of the family of Mr. Elliot (a member of Lippincott's firm), for many years the tenant of Sir David Brewster, at Allerly, and a respected member of my congregation at Melrose; but finding not a soul whom I knew there, had hurried away to get a welcome from one whom I did know and revere, the venerable Principal of Princeton; and finally, I would tell them that although my passage through the States was terribly rapid—a fortnight's flight—it had done me a world of good,—knocking off old prejudices, and putting in their place higher, and, I believe, truer notions of the strength and beauty of American Christianity. I would admit that the men I was thrown among were among the worthiest and best; but I would rather judge a country by its best men than its worst. At all events, this is an unspeakable blessing, that there are "best men" everywhere now-a-days, who are ready to entertain strangers, especially those who are decorated with the blue ribbon of the Presbyterian Council. You see I am taking time by the forelock, and giving you my little speech by a long anticipation. But I do it that I may find utterance for my gratitude on the one hand, and that I may add this other suggestion upon the other, that, when the Council is dissolved, its wholesome influences might be diffused, deepened, and made perpetual by the delegates visiting the Churches, perhaps on some prearranged plan, and in furtherance of some preconceived object. For example, the question of ministerial support is one which might worthily occupy some attention of the Council. An effort has been undertaken in the States in the direction of a general Sustentation Fund. But it had been making (I understood) little headway. As yet, I can conceive no enterprise bearing upon outward organisation more likely

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1870.]

to benefit the Presbyterian Church of America than a Sustentation Fund—embracing the old congregations and the new, the city and the country—the rich and the poor, and binding them in, all in the common interest and brotherhood of a general fund. But I believe that if the Scotch and Irish delegates, who have had practical experience of the working of the system, would devote a couple of months to its advocacy, the languishing scheme might be quickened into a very noble and fruitful enterprise.

One other matter. The duty of the Church in the religious training of its youth formed the subject of an interesting discussion at the last Council. But the Church's duty is scarcely exhausted by the performance of that specific work. Is she not bound to give some deliverance in regard to religious instruction in common schools? Is she not bound, at least, to secure, as far as she can, that the Bible, the one Book on whose teaching all national prosperity depends, shall not be excluded from the common schools? There is at this moment a keen conflict of opinion in regard to the possibility of combining religious instruction with a truly national and honestly unsectarian system—and there is a great diversity of practice. Might not some one be invited to place before the Council a synopsis of the different systems in the different countries; and might not the Council be asked to commit itself to a resolution of this kind, as the minimum which should be asked and agitated for, "That the Word of God shall be recognised and read in every common school throughout the Christian world?"

OPEN COUNCIL.

BIBLE REVISION.

[In our June number, we published a letter from the late Dr. Willis, formerly of Toronto, taking exception to some suggestions made by Professor Dabney, of Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, in an article in our number for April, on the improvement of our version of the Scriptures. Professor Dabney having been from home, writes after an interval of some months in reply to Dr. Willis, now no longer with us. In the peculiar and painful circumstances, we think it best to insert only that part of the letter which more clearly and fully states the leading ground maintained by Professor Dabney for changing the word "servant" in certain parts of our version of Scripture. The much esteemed professor of Union Seminary will, we are sure, concur with us in the propriety of this course.—ED. C. P.]

... WHEN your columns represent me as "blaming King James's Translators for inserting, or rather retaining the word *servant*," my point is wholly missed. No; I justified them for retaining it; because it was then a correct rendering. The flux of its use in our day makes it no longer so. The English word "servant" is doubtless derived from the Latin *servus* (whose original meaning was bondman or slave, only. See Forcellini et Facciolati, Du Fresne's Glossary of Mediæval Latin, and the Lexicons). *Servus* was modified into "servant," in part, possibly, through the Spanish *serviente*, but more through the French *servant*. Both these are from the Latin verb *servio* = "to be a slave," which reappears in the French verb *servir*, for, of this, the present participle is *servant*. The English word "servant" appears in its middle-age form, as "*serf*," a predial bondman. The word "slave," which was also in English use in Shakespeare's day, was immediately from the French *esclave*; Latin, *Sclavi*, Slavonians; because captives of this, their barbarous race, were sold by Venetians as bondmen. In 1614, domestic farming and mining labours were performed in large part by hired persons; and consequently *employés* had come to be called "servants." Yet the word had not lost its proper meaning of *serf*, or bondman also; and for this reason it was then an

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

honest translation for עֶבֶד, δούλος, &c. I commend to your attention, Mr. Editor, the New England lexicographer, Noah Webster. Defining "servant," he says: "3. In Scripture, a slave, a bondman; one purchased for money, and who was compelled to serve till the year of Jubilee. Also, one purchased for a term of years." My point simply is; now that the word has ceased to mean, in popular use, the only thing that δούλος does mean, fidelity to God's truth suggests a change of rendering.

For, it is indisputable that when עֶבֶד, δούλος, &c., are taken in their primary, literal sense, as expressing the industrial relation, they never mean anything but bondman. All statements and illustrations of the tropical meanings of *servus* and "servant," as applied to prophets, satraps, and Wellingtons, are wholly aside from the point. I could prove, by the parallel process, that "slave" does not mean slave. For men are spoken of as "slaves to their passions." The man of truth is "the slave of his word." The polite Frenchman says to a lady: "*Je suis vous votre esclave.*" This would be worthless. What is the relation meant by the words when used in the literal, industrial sense? Let the Lexicons speak. Thus Gesenius:—

עֶבֶד is, "1. A *servant*, who among the Hebrews was also a *slave*." This is the only primary sense given; the tropical ones then immediately follow. So Fürst, and the whole body of Hebraists. They tell us, that when a hired labourer is to be expressed, עֶבֶר, "hireling," is used.

Of δούλος, Dr. Edward Robinson says: "(From δέω) a bondman, slave, servant, properly by birth. . . . The δούλος, therefore, was never a *hired servant*, the latter being called μισθιος, μισθωτός. . . . 1. Properly, of involuntary service, a *slave*; servant; opposite of ἐλεύθερος, 1 Cor. vii. 21; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 15; . . . Septuagint for עֶבֶד."

Precisely so, in substance, speak Bretschneider, Scapula, Schleusner, Leigh (Critica Sacra), Stockius (Clavis), Parkhurst, Passow, and Liddell and Scott. So, as your columns concede, teach M'Knight, Conybeare, Alford, and Lightfoot. So Ellicott, and the Scotchman Eadie. So the great host of Reformed from Calvin down. Farther citations are so needless that they would appear pedantic. It must be more proper to translate so as to let the Holy Spirit say bondman when He means bondman, than to make Him signify to the popular reader, *employé*, when he means something else. I did not dictate to the Revisers any particular term; if the outspoken word "slave" seems unsavoury, let them take any they will, provided it does not mislead. . . .

R. L. DABNEY.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

THE CATECHISM OF 1647.

PERHAPS it may interest your readers to know that the author of the Catechism referred to by your American correspondents was Mr. John Ball, a well-known Puritan divine,—educated at Brazen-nose College, Oxford,—ordained about 1610, without subscription, by an Irish Bishop,—appointed minister at Whitmore, near Newcastle-under-Lyne, with a stipend of £10 *per annum*, and obliged to eke out a scanty subsistence by teaching a school, or acting as chaplain and tutor in a private family. He suffered much for his non-conformity, and died on 20th October, 1640, at the age of 55. Brook gives a full account of him; men of such different schools as Wood, Fuller, and Neale have supplied brief, but favourable, notices; and Baxter has said that he "deserved as high esteem and honour as the best bishop in England." His chief work published during his lifetime was

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

intituled, "A Treatise of Faith, divided into two parts, the first showing the nature, the second the life of faith," which was long held in esteem. But the most valuable of his writings was a "Treatise of the Covenant of Grace," published in 1645 by his friend, Mr. Simeon Ashe. It shows incontestably that there was a fully developed "doctrine of the Covenants" taught in Britain by the time of the Westminster Assembly, independent of and more generally accepted than that which soon after, under Cocceius, gave rise to such bitter controversy in Holland. The recommendatory preface prefixed to it by Calamy, Reynolds, and other divines of the Assembly, makes reference to his Catechism and the exposition thereof, so that unquestionably these were known to the members of the Assembly. The fact, however, that your second correspondent does not feel warranted to trace coincidences between them and the Assembly's Catechisms, save in ten questions, makes me doubt whether they were more consulted than a number of other contemporary Catechisms still preserved in the British Museum and in our Scottish libraries, and of which it is exceedingly difficult to determine how far the questions and answers in one may have been suggested by more or less similar ones in another. In fact, certain questions and answers, in slightly varying forms, appear in quite a number of them, from the early years of the seventeenth century.

So far as *general arrangement and order of questions* are concerned, I am still inclined to think that the treatise which comes nearest to our Catechisms, is the "Chiefe Grounds of Christian Religion," by Ezekiel Rogers, especially throughout the first or doctrinal part. The exposition of the Commandments, however, is very brief; and what relates to death, judgment, and eternity, comes after the exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Next to this, I am somewhat inclined to place "A short Catechism, wherein are briefly handled the fundamental principles of Christian Religion," by Dr. William Gouge. Gouge was a highly-esteemed member of the Assembly, and his Catechism was in its eighth edition in 1636. The copy of Rogers' treatise which I have seen bears the date of 1642, but it claims to have been gathered *long since* for the use of an honourable family. Rogers was minister at Rowley in Yorkshire for nearly thirty years, was forced to emigrate to America in 1638, and laboured for more than twenty years there. At his death, he left his library and other benefactions to Harvard College; and if a copy of his Catechism is not preserved there, I hope our American friends will see that one is got.

So far as *particular questions, and more especially the answers thereto*, are concerned, I think there can be very little doubt from the printed "Minutes" (pp. 282, 283, &c.), that these were seldom taken in slump from any existing treatise, but were carefully elaborated and adjusted by the Assembly and its committees. The first question, "What is the chief end of man?" is evidently from Calvin's *Quis humane vite precipuus est finis?* The first part of the answer may be from Ball or Rogers; the second I have met with only in a Roman Catholic Catechism of 1584, "*gaudere eternamente Deo.*" The second and third questions are probably from Ball or Rogers, though Usher's "*What certain rule have we left us for our direction,*" &c., comes as near as either, as does also his form of questions. The answer to the fourth question, in its original shape ("Minutes," p. 283), resembles closely that of Dr. Gouge, "A spirit of infinite perfection." To its ultimate form, the following appear to me closer approximations than those adduced by your correspondents. 1. "God is a Spirit, one, almighty, eternal, infinite, unchangeable being, absolutely holy, wise, just, and good (*Compendious Catechism* by J. F., London, 1645). 2. God is a Spirit or spiritual substance, most wise, most holy, eternal and infinite (*Elton's Forme of Catechising*, 10th edition, London, 1634). 3. "There is but one God who hath of Himself a spiritual, eternal, unchangeable, and infinite being, perfectly good, just, holy, wise, and mighty" (*A Short Catechisme*, seventh edition, London, 1632). All these run in the form which the answer ultimately took in our Larger Catechism. Stephen Egerton, who published his "Brief Method of Catechising" in 1594, while Ball was still a boy, gives almost the same answer as he to the question, What is God? but in answer

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, December, 1879.]

to the question, What are the communicable properties of God, he gives an answer which, probably, by the transposition of its adjectives and substantives, may have suggested that now found in our Shorter Catechism, "holiness, wisdom, power, justice, and goodness, all which are eternal, infinite, and unchangeable, like Himself."

Your correspondent "G." is disposed to cling to the tradition of Gillespie's special relation to the answer to the question, What is God? But the "Minutes" show that the answer had not been put into its present shape, even in the Larger Catechism, when Gillespie left London ("Minutes," p. 350), and the tradition is, in consequence, abandoned by Dr. Williamson in his recent edition of Dr. Hetherington's "History of the Westminster Assembly." As the only amends I can offer for having reluctantly disturbed it, let me, in conclusion, inform your readers that Dr. Gouge, whose definition was the nearest to that then favoured by the Assembly, and who subjoined, as the Assembly did, some questions on the attributes, cast the whole into the following prayer:—"Thou art of infinite perfection, eternal without beginning, filling all places, knowing all things, searching the heart and trying the reins of the children of men, all-sufficient in Thyself, able to do what Thou wilt, not subject to any change, a God most pure, wise, just, faithful, and merciful." This appears as part of a prayer "drawn out of the principles" contained in his Catechism, and subjoined to it. A. F. M.

ST. ANDREWS.

CORRECTIONS.

In our number for October, in the notice of Professor Gairdner's Lectures on Insanity, page 307, line 12 from bottom, *for* Hegel *read* Hæckel.

The article in same number on "Woman's Foreign Mission Work in America" is by Mrs. Cunningham, wife of Rev. Dr. D. A. Cunningham, Wheeling, West Virginia, U.S., America.

In November number, page 396, "American Items," line 2, *for* three millions *read* three hundred thousand, as the number of Jews in the United States.



